DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 970 HE 006 613

AUTHOR Bruno, Harry E.
TITLE The Development of a Self-Study Model for Non-Traditional Institutions.
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 106p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Walden University; Best Copy Available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Enrichment; *Academic Standards; *Educational Alternatives; Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; *Higher Education; Personal Growth; Professional Recognition; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Florida (Naples); *Walden University

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this document is to focus on the problem of the appropriate and efficient evaluation of innovative, nontraditional institutions of higher education. The applicability of the traditional standards of an academic self-study to the Walden experience is described and assessed. Information was gathered on the Walden alumni, the respective success they have achieved professionally, the impact Walden had on their personal growth and on their intellectual enrichment. Conclusions indicated that serious discussion of nontraditional institutions in higher education is justifiable and necessary in the context of today's American society. It was also concluded that the self-study model for traditional institutions is not generally appropriate for a nontraditional university. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED106970

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SELF-STUDY MODEL FOR NON-TRADITIONAL INSTITUTIONS

By

Harry E. Bruno

B.S. University of Southern California, 1960

M.S. California State University at Los Angeles, 1965

L. Richard Meeth, Ph.D., Advisor
Associate Professor, Higher Education
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo, New York

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 613

Walden University
July, 1975

The purpose of the study was to focus on the problem of the appropriate and efficient evaluation of innovative, non-traditional institutions of higher education. Utilizing the experience of Walden University, Naples, Florida, an institute for advanced studies granting the doctorate in education, as a case study, the applicability of the traditional standards of an academic self-study to the Walden experience was described and assessed.

Information was gathered on the Walden alumni and the respective success they have achieved professionally, as well as the impact Walden had on their personal growth as human beings and their intellectual enrichment. Personal interviews contributed to the impressions on Walden. From the discussion and analysis of this information, further theoretical and practical consideration governing the evolution of a self-study model appropriate to non-traditional educational institutions was described and analyzed.

The overall conclusions regarding the nature and limitations of such a self-study model were then presented, and recommendations were made concerning further research in those areas of self-study and evaluation applicable to non-traditional institutions of higher education.

Most importantly, the conclusions indicated that serious discussion of non-traditional institutions in higher education is justifiable and necessary in the context of today's

American society. It was also concluded that the self-study model normal for traditional institutions is not generally appropriate for a non-traditional university.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere thanks to the many individuals who contributed significantly to the research and preparation of this study. A special expression of appreciation is extended to Dr. L. Richard Meeth, advisor, for his kindly and helpful suggestions during the writing of this study; and to my parents whose constant support throughout my educational endeavors has helped me attain my goals; and, last but by no means least, to my wife, Carol, for her understanding and encouragement throughout the course of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Problem	2
	The Philosophy	6
	The Limitations	7
	Methods and Objectives	8
II.	INNOVATION AND EVALUATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION: THE BACKGROUND AND THE CONTEXT	10
	The Evolution of Higher Education	11
	Problems and Methods of Evaluation	18
	A Rationale for Assessing Non-Traditional Institutions	28
III.	THE SELF-STUDY MODEL: WALDEN UNIVERSITY AS A CASE STUDY	31
	Walden University: An Introductory Description	31
	Self-Study Aims and Methods	34
	The Study Model	37
	Standard I: Purpose	37
	Standard II: Organization and Administration	42
	Standard III: Educational Program	45
	Standard IV: Financial Resources	49
	Standard V: Faculty	51

Chapter Page

Standard VI: Library 54

Standard VII: Student Development Services 56

Standard VIII: Physical Plant 59

Standards IX and X: Special Activities and the Graduate Program 61

A Generic Self-Study Model for Non-Traditional Institutions 62

The Model: Schematic Outline 63

The Philosophy of Standards 77

The Self-Study Model for Non-Traditional Institutions: Summary 79

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 84

BIBLIOGRAPHY 88

APPENDIX A 93

APPENDIX B 97

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Citizens of the developed western world are not merely entering, but are already inexorably caught up within, a rip-tide of change that is coursing through both individuals and social institutions. Nowhere is this trend more apparent than in the field of education, the vital core of the modern nation's developed economy, with its emphasis on innovative knowledge and skilled personnel. As one popular commentator pungently expressed the situation at the beginning of the 1970's:

> Today one billion human beings, the total population of the technology-rich nations, are speeding towards a rendezvous with super-industrialism. Must we experience mass future shock? Or can we, too, achieve a "soft landing"? We are rapidly accelerating our approach. The craggy outlines of the new society are emerging from the mists of tomorrow. Yet even as we speed closer, evidence mounts that one of our most critical subsystems--education--is dangerously malfunctioning. What passes for education today, even in our "best" schools and colleges, is a hopeless anachronism.[1]

The same concern, couched in more temperate language, was evident in the June, 1973, Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Summarizing major themes in their area of study, the Commission members noted:

---

[1]Alvin Toffler, Future Shock (New York: Random House, 1970; Bantam Books, 1971), p. 398.

> Conflicts over purposes exist in higher education in the United States today. These conflicts affect both internal conduct of institutions and external relations between institutions and society. A period for re-examination of purposes . . . is at hand . . . A continuing conflict over purposes must be expected in the future . . . We believe that both higher education and American society should be alert to the possibility of a "time of troubles" over purposes, [and] should understand that the "good old days" of consensus . . . may not soon return . . . .[1]

The Problem

Consideration of the accelerating rate of change in the circumambient society may be left to those qualified to make such analysis; but it is important to note that unless the observation of external social change by educators is matched by equally rigorous critical study and analysis of the internal aspects of education itself, and its role vis-a-vis the external society, then the academic "window on the world" beloved of educators may well become clouded due to unresolved problems of the role of education and the perceptions of educators. At worst--and despite all protestations to the contrary--this hard-won "window on the world" may turn into a mirror reflecting only the internal inadequacies of the perceiving educator and the institutions with which he is associated.

Meanwhile, the doctoral degrees continue to pour forth--but in an atmosphere of increasing crisis. The whole situation is summed up in two tart but characteristically

---

[1]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Report (Berkeley, California: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, June, 1973), pp. 1, 3.

pertinent comments by Clark Kerr, writing in his capacity as the Carnegie Commission's chairman. On the production of Ph.D.'s, Kerr noted:

> Graduate and professional education is enormously costly and has been the most rapidly growing level of American higher education . . . The number of Ph.D.'s turned out tripled from 1960 to 1970, and could well triple again by 1980 . . . By then, there might be a real crisis of over-supply . . . .[1]

The crisis atmosphere, with educational institutions steering an unhappy course between the shoals of financial astringency and excessively expensive reform, is characterized by Kerr as follows:

> Today colleges and universities are pushed simultaneously toward costly change on the one hand and retrenchment on the other by concerned critics both on and off the campus. Some of these critics urge colleges to reform the instructional experience with enriched curricula and innovative teaching methods. Others warn the institutions against financial disaster and urge presidents to slash costs in every possible way . . . .[2]

A real and critical test of an educational institution, therefore, is its ability to change with the times. And change there certainly has been; in higher education there has been a marked and innovative upsurge in non-traditional institutions and programs. A recent survey indicated that there were 1,000 to 1,400 non-traditional programs in

---

[1]Clark Kerr, Foreward to Graduate and Professional Education, 1980, by Lewis B. Mayhew (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970), p. v.

[2]Clark Kerr, Foreward to Efficiency in Liberal Education, by Howard R. Bowen and Gordon K. Douglass (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., for the Macalester Foundation and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971), p. xi.

institutions of higher education and that most of these were two years old or less.[1]

But how is the effectiveness of such non-traditional institutions to be judged? These non-traditional institutions are growing in number and may be filling a vital need at the highest levels of the American educational system, itself a nodal point of the changing American society. The Carnegie Commission has suggested that one improvement in the system of higher education would have as its purpose "Better rules and understandings to govern exercise of the critical evaluation of society."[2] But before such external examinations can be made, it is necessary to demonstrate that an equally rigorous self-examination can be devised to cover higher education itself, specifically the self-study needs of evolving non-traditional institutions. The basic objective of the present study, therefore, is, by means of a thorough examination of a particular case study, Walden University, to evolve and establish a self-study model applicable to non-traditional institutions.

The essential purpose of the self-study process is to improve the educational effectiveness of the institution; the procedures of the process are designed to help measure success in meeting stated goals. A model self-study program

---

[1]John R. Valley, "Increasing the Options," in Recent Developments in College and University Degree Programs (Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1972), unnumbered page.

[2]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Report, p. 2.

should therefore permit non-traditional institutions to engage in an evaluative process yielding important qualitative and quantitative data. The construction of such a model, based on extensive research and analysis, may result in a unique blend of theoretical discussion and practical research. Development of the model is itself symptomatic of the adaptations that can and must be made if there is to be any meaningful coming to terms with the emergent new world of education and society that increasingly challenges the thinking citizen of the last decades of the twentieth century.

A specific rationale may be developed to justify the selection of Walden University for the purposes of a case study during the process of constructing a self-study model for non-traditional institutions. According to the philosophy set forth by the writer, Walden University fits into the non-traditional institution design pattern. It began operation in Naples, Florida, in 1971. It had 140 students initially and was incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida as a proprietary institution with authority to grant doctoral degrees in education. As the institution's 1974 catalogue states: "Walden University has steadily developed as an institution firmly dedicated to the belief that the time for positive innovation in higher education has arrived."[1] Further, Walden focuses within the field of

---

[1]Walden University, Doctoral Program in Education (Naples, Florida: Walden University, Institute for Advanced Studies, 1973), p. 2.

higher education generally on the subject matter of education itself and is thus internally concerned with evaluations of the type under discussion. Finally, it may be noted that this institution, though of relatively recent foundation, has not yet been subjected to an in-depth evaluation of its declared objectives. Hence, development of a self-study model using Walden may also enable both this University and its graduates to determine to what extent the objectives of the non-traditional institution have been, and are being, met.

The Philosophy

From the beginning of this paper, there has been constant mention of the non-traditional philosophy of education. Below is the writer's conception of what the non-traditional philosophy of education should be.

The non-traditional philosophy, as the writer sees it, creates a climate where learning can be achieved through many avenues, the main one being student awareness and responsibility. The focus is on significant academic freedom, self-motivation, intellectual interaction, human understanding, and sensitivity to the ever-changing concepts of life's meaning.

It means the encouraging of creative thinking, the ability to avail oneself to all types of learning resources--books, tapes, teachers, community resources, and the like--and the chance to come to know one's potential and to reach a clear understanding of one's purpose. A philosophy that

generates an environment that leads one to explore the outer limits of one's ability.

It goes without saying that such a philosophy cannot be bound by tradition and rigid, unchanging rules. The only way such a system can function is through an ability to cope with change and modern ideas put forth by modern man. For basic to man's understanding of truth is the realization that with each new truth perceived by the intellect, conceptualizations of the surrounding environment change. Modern education must keep up with that change.

The Limitations

The very nature of the topic being considered here establishes the major limitations of the study. Non-traditional education is an on-going, dynamic process in the state of "becoming" rather than status-quo. Even the most modern evaluative techniques are implemented by somewhat stable, permanent methods that lack the dynamics required to measure something as flexible and ever-changing as the "non-traditional institution."

Keeping this in mind, the writer realizes the difficulty involved in arriving at an acceptable evaluation of the system, since the natural tendency is to expect results that are acceptable in the traditional mold. Definite problems are inherent in a study of this kind; however, the evaluation is possible once the limitations are established.

The writer is aware that the long-range effects are difficult to determine. In using a specific institution such

as Walden University, a certain problem emerges in that the institution is a recent one. The far-reaching consequences and effects of education there cannot be fully perceived for several years in the future. Yet some attempt must be made in order to prepare for that future.

Study has been made of the impact Walden University accomplished from its beginning to the present. Other non-traditional institutions exist but only Walden was considered here. This was done mainly because of the writer's respect for the institution and his familiarity with the approach put forth there.

The idea to evaluate other institutions along with Walden was considered but abandoned, fearing that serious in-depth analysis would be sacrificed for the sake of variety. Walden is not meant to appear the "end-all in education," but rather, the one institution that has undergone considerable evaluation and, throughout it all, remains a credible institution of higher learning.

Methods and Objectives

Chapter II of the present study will examine the literature and the wider context of non-traditional institutions as adaptations to changing educational environments. An examination will also be made of the philosophical and methodological premises that necessarily underlie any evaluative assessment of these institutions, and a rationale for assessing non-traditional higher education will be developed.

A detailed examination of the Walden experience, comprehensive and institution-wide in character, will then evaluate past and present resources, faculty, students, and program considered throughout in close relation to the purpose and objectives of the institution.

The development of the self-study model was based on both research and personal interviews. Through the use of these methods, qualitative data concerning such areas as purpose, organization and administration, educational program, financial resources, faculty, library, student personnel, physical plant, special activities, graduate program, and research were collected, analyzed, and recorded during the construction of the self-study model and as adjuncts to the study. Following the presentation and discussion of this material, a detailed self-study model suitable for general use by non-traditional institutions was outlined.

In sum, therefore, the overall objective of the study was to evolve a self-study model for non-traditional institutions, utilizing the example of Walden University, as evidenced in the 1971-74 period, as a case study. The study is intended to make an effective theoretical and practical contribution toward the resolution of the twin aspects of the contemporary crisis in American education: the problems of effective innovation and of effective evaluation.

CHAPTER II

INNOVATION AND EVALUATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION: THE BACKGROUND AND THE CONTEXT

An investigation which focuses attention on the non-traditional institution immediately generates two areas of concern: the need to touch upon the broader background and philosophy of educational innovations--in history generally and in American higher education in particular--and to consider the philosophical aspects of the establishment of criteria by which innovations in non-traditional institutions may be effectively assessed.

First, however, it is necessary to note that no ready answers appear in the literature on the question of what a university is or should be--and where answers are given on the latter point, the actual implementation of reform is often far removed from the publication of, say, a committee report. With regard to the issue of what, exactly, today's university is, the comment of Heiss was pertinent:

> Probably at no point in the history of higher education has there been so much confusion and controversy over the role of the university as prevails today. Contributors to scholarly journals, reports for the daily press and slick magazines, communicators in the electronic media, and the man in the street marshal facts and construct arguments which demonstrate the wide diversity of opinion that exists about its purpose and function. They also demonstrate and amplify

> the vast body of genuine misinformation about what a university is, and what its responsibilities are.[1]

Concerning the second point, the comment of a reviewer of one of the many Carnegie-sponsored studies[2] was terse and pertinent:

> After more than five years of labor, the university reform movement has brought forth mountains of committee reports but only little educational change. . . . Proposals . . . are watered down before they are adopted; inconsequential answers are given because the wrong questions are asked . . . .[3]

The Evolution of Higher Education

Be that as it may, the history of higher education may be perceived as a dialectical process. A primary motivating factor has been man's need to expand the great circle of learning embracing himself and the universe he inhabits. As one modern educator put it:

> The concept of curriculum is far older than that of a university. For the most part the medieval university inherited its curriculum from the cathedral schools which in turn had followed the program of studies in the ancient academies. In major matters the curriculum of the modern university differs very little from that of the most ancient schools. There is an essential quality in what is important for men to know. Learning to live in paleolithic times and in the twentieth century involves the same circle of learning: man's understanding of himself in terms of

---

[1] Ann M. Heiss, Challenges to Graduate Schools: The Ph.D. Program in Ten Universities (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1970), p. 6.

[2] Dwight R. Ladd, Change in Educational Policy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970).

[3] Fred M. Hechinger, "Much Talk But Little Action on Campus Reform," New York Times, August 9, 1970, Education Section, p. 5.

> his past and of his relation to his environment, spiritual, social, and physical . . . The history of the curriculum is the story of the shifting of emphasis and of method with respect to this great circle of learning . . . .[1]

Thus, where man and the world have changed, and higher education has reflected, if not stimulated, the process of change, the university has moved forward. But on the other hand, retarding this development and yet shaping its movement has been the ever-present threat of the dead hand of authority--or of competing authorities--that has acted as a shackle on educational innovation. The remarks of a noted educator shortly after the turn of the century, made while comparing the American colonial curriculum with that of its European predecessors, have retained validity over the decades:

> The exercise did become absurd, but its origin was natural, even necessary. It degenerated into the spinning of cobwebs in a circle, there was incessant movement but no advance . . . . The Bible, the church fathers, the classical authors, the formal deliverance of ecclesiastics, were the metes and bounds for mankind . . .. Education gloated on the past, poring over lands already trodden by thousands of feet instead of seeking new roads in other fields. The dead hand shaded the world.[2]

The history of higher education in the western world can be considered as little more than a tug-of-war between these two trends, the one advancing, the one retarding the course of knowledge. In ancient Greece the great creative impulse of clustering scholars and teachers that enabled citizens

---

[1]Noah Edward Fehl, The Idea of a University in East and West, (Hong Kong: Chung Chi College, 1962), pp. 68-69.

[2]Colyer Meriwether, Our Colonial Curriculum: 1607-1776 (Washington, D.C.: Capital Publishing Co., 1907), pp. 225-226.

to become educated in ways that would ensure the defense of the city in any crisis could become mired in the swamps of sophistry or the harsh categories of Sparta as much as it could move in the elegant progressions of Athenian dialogues. In any event, the fall of the Graeco-Roman world left the embryonic Church nurturing the spirit of inquiry along with the inquisitive Arabic minds of the expanding world of Islam and the secretive consciousness of the Jews. The university--at least an institution cognizant of itself as such--appeared in Europe during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries as renewed clusterings of communities of teachers and scholars whose corporate and sometimes questioning, existence had been given sanction and recognition by civil or ecclesiastical authority. The universities rose in response to new needs--those of the nation-state, and an incipient mercantile bourgeoisie--and, equally, out of a feeling that the intelligent appreciation of the truth that imbued spirituality depended on correct utilization of prescribed methodologies of argumentation: a development climaxed in Scholasticism. At the turn of the sixteenth century it appeared that the revival of classical humanism was to take a huge step forward but the authoritarian disputes of rival religions cramped the style and spirit of renewed inquiry. Formalism and sectarianism prevailed; the first real modern university is often regarded as taking shape with the foundation of the University of Halle in 1693--but not until the eighteenth century

Enlightenment did the universities move forward once again.[1]

In the East, meanwhile, similar authoritarian sentiments had plagued the enquiring mind for centuries. As Meriwether eloquently described the situation:

> . . . among a people often the opposite of ourselves in view and action, there was a duplication of this spirit, though there was no communication of methods from one to the other. Confucius, the mighty captain of the orient in ethics and pedagogics, had laid the foundation for a similar training in China . . . (all was taught) as a sodden lift of memory, unrelieved by new ideas, with endless reproduction of notions handed down for generations.[2]

The advances of the Enlightenment, however, were soon--with varying degrees of success--coopted by newer governmental and commercial forces. In what was to become modern Germany, religious and political turbulence precluded adequate university development; but in France, in 1808, the entire educational system was adopted by the state, headed by Napoleon, in a move that left lasting patterns. In Britain, the demands of capitalism for new knowledge, and the rise of mass education, spurred a related growth in universities, with the state taking a major hand, particularly after the experience of two world wars. Japan, meanwhile, had initiated a century of modernization by making education a focus of its emergence on a global scale. In Russia, the October Revolution had brought forth practical ideas for the utilization of education in "human engineering," with

---

[1]Meriwether, Our Colonial Curriculum, pp. 10-12.

[2]Ibid., p. 14.

universities serving as powerhouses of Soviet planning. In the United States, the Land Grant Act of the Civil War period had, along with industrialization, spurred a great and controversial university expansion. All of these movements forward in university life, spurred by the growth of science, of commerce, and of the Enlightenment, ebbed and flowed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as authoritarianism--often in subtle guises as well as in overtly brutal manifestations--retarded innovation and bureaucratized structures and organizations.[1]

The particular ebbs and flows of this process, of the struggle between traditional and innovative methods, have been detailed within the United States by Benjamin, by Brubacher and Rudy, and by Rippa, to select only a few studies from among many.[2] The landmarks, too, are well known. They cluster in four broad historical periods: the colonial and post-Revolutionary period to the Civil War; from the Civil War to World War I; the inter-war period; and the post 1945 era. In the first of these periods, higher education labored under the twin handicaps of servile imitation of European classical precedent and the ideological straitjackets of religion and class. In 1642, for example, Henry Dunster introduced at Harvard the famous statutes molding the

---

[1]Harold R. W. Benjamin, Higher Education in the American Republics (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1965); John Seiler Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition: An American History, 1936-1956 (New York: Harper and Row, 1958); S. Alexander Rippa, Education in a Free Society: An American History (New York: David McKay, 1967).

[2]Ibid.

curriculum in an unhappy blend of medieval liberal education, Renaissance classicism, and the reformation ideal of religious control of secular institutions. The Yale Report of 1828 not only confirmed this classical approach, but set a trend that continued to the Civil War. Yet, as always, contrary trends of innovation, peculiarly American in nature, rose up in response to the pressures of enquiring minds. Anti-sectarian sentiment flared, and Enlightenment ideals found practical expression to some degree in innovations initiated by Franklin and Jefferson. Even the early nineteenth century religious fervor that gripped the colleges (conservative in the East, evangelical in the West) had a New World flavor. After the Civil War, the emergent captains of industry heralded a new era of innovation--foreign language and science electives, the establishment of new universities by rich donors whose sources of wealth did not always bear close examination, and a great expansion of state-linked higher education bodies emphasizing graduate and professional "practical" studies at the expense of the old Socratic "recitations" of classicism. Research proliferation, the spirit of free enquiry (as long as it was pursued by gentlemen scholars untainted by European doctrines) appeared to flourish. Before, during, and after World War I, interdisciplinary studies made an appearance at Columbia, Wilson reformed Princeton; and the higher education system grappled, as did the larger society, with the Depression. During and after World War II, other innovations flourished--the Hutchins system at the University of Chicago,

for instance, and the ubiquitous Great Books Program. The post-1945 era is well summarized by Barzun:

> [The American university now emerged] as the by-product of its own war effort. It was the Manhattan Project, the V-12 program, the G.I. Bill of Rights, following close upon the participation of the academic community in the New Deal, that catapulted the University into its present headlong rush. To that momentum was added, after the War, the impetus of a world power that must continue to mobilize academic men for global advice and activity.[1]

But here again innovation went hand in hand with less worthy aspects; in this case, the dark days of McCarthyism and what some came to regard as the sterile categories of cold war expansionism.

Finally, everything was accentuated in the 1960's and beyond: a rise in enrollment, post-Sputnik emulation pressures, the Vietnam quagmire, the upheavals on the campus, renewed pressures from minorities and women, a new period of national crisis and uncertainty. The events of this recent past are often painfully engrained in the minds of any thinking educator, and there are few who will deny that both innovative and retrograde forces (often hiding under labels proclaiming opposite intentions) were much in evidence. The innovative trend in non-traditional higher education has already been noted.

For the purposes of this study, therefore, it seems pertinent to note, in summary, the following characteristics

---

[1] Jacques Barzun, The American University: How it Runs, Where it is Going (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), p. 7.

discernible in the history of higher education: firstly, that higher education is not a static process; as societies change, so universities, too, may change. Secondly, change is neither easy nor automatic; a forward movement merely indicates a temporary victory of the forces of adaptation and innovation over those of retrogression and reaction.

Problems and Methods of Evaluation

There are further critical implications arising from, although not explicitly stated in, the preceding discussion. For--most pertinently from the viewpoint of the present study--if higher educational institutions change, then it seems reasonable to conclude that the methods of evaluating them must also change if they are to be of lasting effectiveness. Only a productive combination of innovation and evaluation can, it seems, enable the true goals of a university education, as socially determined, to be met.

Yet it is necessary at the outset to face the fact that there are many problems and difficulties that researchers in the higher education field must resolve if they are to be in a position to clarify the objectives of educational institutions and to evaluate their effectiveness in meeting those objectives--the more so if they are non-traditional in nature. Three comments drawn from the many studies available in the literature illustrate the basic range of the problems. Bowen and Douglass came right to the point in their survey of educational efficiency:

> Efficiency is measured as a ratio between two variables: cost and output. An increase in efficiency occurs, for example, when output increases while cost remains constant. In the case of ordinary commodities such as wheat or electricity, output is quite easy to measure in terms of standard units . . . and cost per unit becomes an unambiguous measure of efficiency. But in the case of education, units of output are extraordinarily difficult to measure because each variation in cost may result in a qualitatively different output. One's estimate of efficiency, therefore, must be based on relatively subjective judgements about output.[1]

The British organizational and systems analyst, Rice, turning his attention to the international modern university, has nonetheless essayed an attempt at a comprehensive systems analysis:

> An institution whose primary task is education has students as intakes; teaching as the activities of the conversion systems; and those who have learned, or have failed to learn, as outputs. The measure of the productivity of the system is the difference between intakes and outputs, usually symbolized by the award, or non-award, of a degree or diploma. The resources required for task performance are teachers and the appropriate buildings and equipment.[2]

Unhappily, Rice's model, derived from commercial experience, appears ill suited to the university environment. As Lord Fulton, the British educator, noted in a Foreword: "I would have wished to ask . . . whether a model organization based exclusively upon the analysis of identifiable definable tasks . . . does not run the risk of converting the

---

[1]Howard R. Bowen and Gordon K. Douglass, Efficiency in Liberal Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., for the MacArthur Foundation and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971), p. 3.

[2]A. K. Rice, The Modern University: A Model Organization (New York and London: Tavistock Publications, 1970), p. 11.

universities into no more than instruments."[1] The same point was made even more tellingly by Wolff:

> . . . in terms of the goals of the university itself--namely, education--the dropout may have actually learned more by dropping out than the "successful" student learned by staying. In such a case, applying the criterion of efficiency, we should put the dropout in the profit column and the degree holder in the loss column. An admission policy which picked the dropout would be more efficient than one which didn't. Yet, is there a dean of admissions in America who could contemplate a dropout rate of . . . fifty percent with equanimity and believe that he had an efficient procedure?[2]

Given these difficulties, many serious attempts have nevertheless been made to outline the problems involved in developing both curricula and instruction, specifically in non-traditional institutions. A durable attempt to grapple with these was made by Tyler, who noted the following basic difficulties:

> 1. What educational purpose or objectives should the school or course seek to attain?
>
> 2. What learning experiences can be provided that are likely to bring about the attainment of these purposes?
>
> 3. How can these learning experiences be effectively organized to help provide continuity and sequence for the learner, and to help him in integrating what might otherwise appear as isolated learning experiences?
>
> 4. How can the effectiveness of learning experiences be evaluated by the use of tests and other systematic evidence-gathering procedures?[3]

---

[1] A. K. Rice, The Modern University, p. viii.

[2] Robert Paul Wolff, The Ideal of the University (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), pp. 82-83.

[3] Ralph W. Tyler, "Achievement Testing and Curriculum Construction," in Trends in Student Personnel Work, ed. by E. G. Williamson (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1949), pp. 391-407.

For both traditional and non-traditional institutions, therefore, it seems that an effective method of considering the problem of evaluation is to consider the objectives of such institutions and then to consider potential measures that may serve to evaluate the range of choices available to meet those goals.

Educational objectives--and this applies equally to traditional and non-traditional institutions--spring from many sources. The three basic sources are the teaching staff (working on the basis of previous experience and aided by consideration of alternative kinds of data); the student body (characterized by level of development, needs, and interests), who may complement the learning theory and educational philosophy emanating from the faculty; and last, but of central importance, the contribution of actual subject matter within a discipline or disciplines.

Taken together, these sources of potential goals generate a problem of potential selection among goals requiring more time and effort than any one school can usually command. The problem of selection among possible objectives, as well as of the determination of the relative emphasis to be given to various objectives, requires the use of some overall guiding philosopy; and the school's own philosophy of education serves as one guide in that it encompasses the institution's own viewpoint regarding the "good life for the individual in the good society."[1]

---

[1] Benjamin S. Bloom, ed., Classification of Educational Goals (New York: David McKay, 1956), p. 27.

It may be objected that there can indeed be no other source than the school's philosophy of education for determining the goals of the institution. However, that philosophy by itself may not necessarily be indicative of what is actually going on in the institution. Traditional educational bodies tend to be large and bureaucratic, and their stated goals may well reflect adaptations to situations in the past. For example, the stated philosophical assumptions of a large traditional institution's goals may reflect political, financial, and demographic assumptions that held a decade or more ago; yet changing demographic circumstances affecting student intake, and the financial difficulties reflecting, say, the hostility of a state legislature or wealthy alumni to manifestations of student activism, may have resulted in substantial (and unacknowledged) handicaps to the practical application of those assumptions. In short, professed philosophical goals may well, in practice, have been tacitly abandoned due to practical exigencies.

It is perhaps as a result of such situations that the reservations already noted concerning over-rigorous application of cost-analysis techniques to higher education have, in part, been abandoned as the need to make realistic and workable evaluations has become more and more pressing. Semi-quantitative assessments in the field of higher education have therefore been attempted by some researchers. Weldon, for example, studying Canadian data, utilized a range of indices including faculty-student ratio, faculty qualifications,

(proportion of doctorates), retention rates at undergraduate and graduate levels, and so on.[1] But here again there are difficulties. Business, government, or self-learned educational experience may be just as important as doctorates to instructors and, as many students know to their dismay, a doctorate may reflect research capacity, not the ability to teach and to communicate effectively.

Further measurement of quality in traditional and non-traditional education alike may perhaps be associated with patterns of educational spending. But here, too, cost may be misleading. A well-stocked library is useless if not related to the research carried out and may well be less cost-effective than access to the libraries of neighboring institutions, with a "core" of, perhaps, microfiche material. Relative expenditure on research as opposed to instruction is equally meaningless unless prior judgments have been made as to the efficacy of the research. And the proportion of fixed costs to instruction-costs may indicate size, and perhaps administrative efficiency, but rarely educational quality.

The capacities of the student body in any one institution may be one effective measure: "The use of the selectivity index as a measure of quality is based on the premise that a university can never be much better than its students and is

---

[1] K. Laurence Weldon, Inter-Provincial Comparisons of Cost and Quality of Higher Education (Toronto: Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, 1970), pp. 47-51.

not likely to be much worse," as Morgan and Siragelden put it.[1] But do better students make for better schools, or do good schools attract a better class of students? Measurement of this factor is obviously difficult. In sum, therefore, the problem of measurement of quality is a difficult one--the university's role as a preserver of knowledge may be a function of the level of society as a whole; its role as a discoverer of talent, or as an extender of knowledge, is equally unmeasurable; and a test to evaluate the comparative quality of its ability to transmit knowledge is not easy to design.

But in order to evaluate a new, non-traditional institution, its educational role must be considered and its quality measured with care, for a faulty evaluation may well be worse than none at all.

A survey of the literature, and certain a priori assumptions, suggest the following four steps as potential clarifications in the area of evaluation:

1. Clarifying the particular educational function for which evaluation is needed. For example: studying and formulating the purposes and the steps involved in diagnosing individual learning;

2. Following such clarification, establishing a methodological framework appropriate to the investigation of

---

[1]James Morgan and Israel Siragelden, "A Note on the Quality Dimension in Education," Journal of Political Economy, LXXVI (September-October, 1968), 1,075.

these functions and the assessment of the empirical evidence accumulated;

3. Selecting and developing evaluation instruments consistent with the empirical finding and methodological framework followed;

4. Emphasizing continuous revision on the basis of data resulting from the use of these instruments.

Developing this pattern of approach, Gould and Cross have identified four major characteristics that are applicable specifically to non-traditional education. Such education is marked, according to these researchers, by:

1. The philosophy of full educational opportunity regardless of age, previous formal education, or circumstances of life.

2. The elements of structure, method, content, and procedure that combine to create a new educational flexibility.

3. The new or expanded educational roles being assumed by business; industry; labor unions; governmental, cultural, and social agencies; military commands; proprietary schools; correspondence institutes; and the like.

4. Individualized learning and student goal-selection, with individual student responsibility for working to that goal.[1]

While Gould and Cross have specifically concerned themselves with non-traditional institutions, changes have also

---

[1]Samuel B. Gould and K. Patricia Cross, eds., Explorations in Non-Traditional Study (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), Introduction.

been taking place at very large educational institutions; and these changes have caused similar reassessments to be made in the appropriate methodology of evaluation. In attempting to evaluate such changes and their significance, Hodgkinson, for example, has demonstrated how faculty at very large institutions offering advanced degrees teach fewer hours, have more interest in research and less loyalty to the institution, obtain tenure at an earlier age, speak more on national policy, and support students who oppose administrations.[1] The institutional changes discussed by Hodgkinson may well be symptomatic of a complex system of bureaucratization and centralization of power in higher education at the expense of university, educational, and human values. The net result is less openness to constructive change. The recent focus on specialized methodology, computer science, systems simulation, sensitivity analyses, mathematical programming, and games theory is illustrative of both isolation of scholarship and the fragmentation of specialization.

Such tendencies are but the other side of the coin of increasing evidence of innovation and emergence of non-traditional structures in contemporary higher education. Innovators see the need to discover a genuine educational order through a non-bureaucratic, decentralized, dynamic structure. Some would go so far as to say that the basic forces of the existing culture no longer sustain the degree

---

[1] Harold L. Hodgkinson, A Profile of Change in Higher Education: Institutions in Transition (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1971), p. 295 et seq.

structure and that the forms deriving from it are rapidly dying. In fact, much of the current turmoil in higher education--the unsettled state of the grading system, the search for nondisciplinary modes of study, attempts to reduce the specialization pressures feeding the "publish or perish" syndrome--represents attempts to come to grips with needed changes. The evaluation system itself is a touchy problem, offering as it does the chance to judge innovation--but also to point out embarrassing failures. And around every educational body, society itself--and its modes of communication--is changing at an accelerating rate, in ways ranging from technological invention to changing value systems.

Innovation itself, then, is a key factor in contemporary evaluations of education. It may be evaluated rationally by collecting objective data as to the objectives, processes, and outcomes of innovations. Some questions arise. Is new subject matter being taught, or should there be a shift of emphasis within traditional content? Are abnormal amounts of teacher energy required to ensure that innovation works? What is the relationship between the degree of innovation and the range of teacher competence? Does the innovation recast the teacher in the role of planner of instruction and presenter of information or as monitor of a self-instructional process and evaluator of learning? What about the cost of evaluation itself? How much space or location does the new approach call for?

It seems reasonable to conclude that innovation cannot be evaluated unless it is considered in context. Yet many decisions on innovations--both adoption decisions and rejection decisions--may well be less than rational because process and output information is not available for either the innovation or the non-traditional institution that may be trying it out.

A Rationale for Assessing Non-Traditional Institutions

The preceding discussion has touched on some of the problems that arise when generally attempting to make critical assessments of both traditional and non-traditional institutions of higher education, both of which may well be in a state of flux in relation to even the most fundamental aims and goals. One overriding conclusion that may perhaps be drawn from this discussion is that learning, after all, must still be the end product of instruction, whether this takes place in a traditional or non-traditional institution. An evaluation system which is adequate for assessing learning under a regular program, if modified to take into account any genuinely new learning objectives of an innovation or of an innovating institution, should be fully adequate for evaluating the learning that arises from the innovative process. Such a system will make possible both a comprehensive survey of non-traditional institutions and a meaningful relationship to evaluation of the traditional institutions with which they increasingly compete.

But a specific rationale can also be developed, within this general framework, for assessing non-traditional higher education. There are distinctive features to the non-traditional approach. These include the following characteristics:

1. A tendency for the institution concerned to possess a coherent and highly articulated educational philosophy that structures the workings of that institution, considered as a system, to a much greater extent than the corresponding traditional institution, where pragmatic policies representing administrative accretions and accommodations developed over a long period of time may hold sway;

2. A tendency for the non-traditional institution to be both young and innovative in approach;

3. A tendency for the non-traditional institution to place heavy emphasis on human values and an individual approach to educational processes;

4. A marked flexibility and a willingness to abandon policies that appear unproductive or counter-productive;

5. A lack of concern with the past, and an unusually developed philosophical and pragmatic concern with the shaping of the future.

An assessment of such non-traditional institutions must, therefore, have a distinctive approach of its own, paralleling the unique approaches of the non-traditional institutions themselves. Certain guiding methodological principles appear to suggest themselves in this respect.

The assessment must concern itself with present orientation and future plans, with evaluations of historical development kept to a minimal importance. The evaluation must succeed in making itself adaptable and flexible enough to capture the essence of the particular non-traditional institution that is being assessed. It must be prepared to grapple with problems arising from the critical discussion of human values and individual freedom--areas that do not lend themselves to rigorous quantitative assessment. Similarly, it will devote minimal attention to the adequacy and characteristics of physical structures except insofar as these facets of higher educational life have a direct relationship to underlying purposes and values. Finally, the assessment of non-traditional institutions must find ways of responding to the unique character of each institution studied, however much this may cause difficulties in building an overall model that will apply in all cases in a fast-growing area of higher education today.

Such an evaluation system, based on the methodological principles whose broad outlines have been considered in the preceding discussion, will be evolved during the remainder of the present study, which will, as has already been indicated, focus on the specific experience of Walden University, a major representative of the new non-traditional institutions.

CHAPTER III

THE SELF-STUDY MODEL: WALDEN UNIVERSITY AS A CASE STUDY

The preceding discussion has surveyed the broad field of educational change and innovation and noted some of the theoretical and practical problems associated with evaluation. The following discussion will evolve and present, in detail, a self-study model for non-traditional educational institutions, utilizing the experiences of Walden University as an example and case study. The model evolved will be structured around ten self-study standards, each of which will be examined with particular reference to adequate coverage of innovative and non-traditional elements. Prior to this discussion, however--and indeed as an essential preliminary to it--an initial descriptive statement regarding the nature and function of Walden University will be presented, followed by an explicit formulation of the self-study aims and methods, both theoretical and practical, that underlie the subsequent examination of data and the formulation of the model.

Walden University: An Introductory Description

Walden University was founded in 1970 and began operations

in Naples, Florida, in 1971 with 110 students. It is incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida as a proprietary institution with authority to grant the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees in education, and since early 1973 has been licensed by the Florida State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities. To obtain their degrees the students, in addition to completing a one-month summer residence program, must have completed at least sixty credit hours beyond the baccalaureate and a dissertation or project for the degree. Twenty-four of the sixty credits must have been earned at Walden. The program is open to individuals with a master's degree plus nine credits, or the equivalent, and three years of experience in education or allied fields. Life experience credits may be offered but are subject to rigorous examination.

Walden's geographic location and physical plant contribute to the fulfillment of the University's role as a "community of scholars." A conference center provides "ample room for lectures, debates, discussions," and so on while "office and library space are conveniently situated in the midst of the academic complex."[1] Students use the library and other facilities on a daily basis when the University is in session; the library is also open to local residents at such times. Living accommodations for students, all of them offered independently of the University establishment proper,

---

[1]Walden University, Institute for Advance Studies, Doctoral Program in Education (Naples, Fla.: Walden University, October, 1973), p. 13.

are available; and special facilities include a swimming pool, a marina, and numerous recreational facilities.

The administrative structure of Walden is an expression of an underlying innovative and non-traditional educational philosophy. In the view of the University, Walden is not simply another mechanical approach to graduate degrees but is regarded as being far more than that--an environment offering a humanized educational process for the professional educator so that his aspirations and personal, inner worth may be recognized. This is the basic Walden Goal, and all other Walden Goals follow from it. The Walden philosophy holds that this environment will have an impact on the participating applicants because they and it will become one with each other in the sequential educational process. The fellowship atmosphere is strongly emphasized, seeking to bring out the best from each of candidates, faculty, and administration. The Walden setting, as demonstrated in practice by actual experience since the University's founding, provides a recognition of man's mutual responsibilities to his personal, professional, and social milieu that can be energized in such a fashion as to create positive change.

Walden University maintains that it has helped overcome some traditional barriers--including age, sex, profession or trade, and race--inhibiting advancement in the educational profession. The method has been to give full rein to the energy and ability of individual students, who

are expected to demonstrate a great deal of effort, interest, and application of talent. Walden has also sought to ease the financial burden occasioned by what are held to be the over-rigid residency requirements of older, larger, and more traditional institutions. The University feels that its facilities and plant are such as to encourage to the maximum the development of an environment appropriate to a true community of scholars, energizing the group in a manner conducive to the best personal and professional results.

The capacity of the University to meet its goals, and indeed the desirability of the goals themselves, will therefore be analyzed from both theoretical and practical aspects as part of the process of the evolution of the self-study model for non-traditional institutions.

Self-Study Aims and Methods

The basic aim of an institutional self-study program is, of course, to raise the level of educational effectiveness of an institution. It should be noted at the outset that rigorous quantitative methods, while a necessary adjunct of all forms of scholarly inquiry, are of minimal effectiveness in measuring the success of a non-traditional institution, although qualitative methodologies, utilizing the normal apparatus of scholarly research and examination, are essential to such investigations. The overall methodological framework of the self-study process evolved in the present study, therefore, makes every effort to incorporate objective scientific observation and research. In this context, the

discussion of methodology made by Dressel in his survey of problems of evaluation of educational institutions is especially pertinent to the methodological framework of the present study:

> Interrelated with the matter of models is the matter of the methodology which is used. The professional evaluator tends to prefer an experimental mode and makes heavy use of statistics and objective measurements. He seeks more and more rigorous research and more and more precise measurement in the hope that ultimately educational research can answer some basic questions about learning . . . [But] educational research, as carried on over a period of years, has not brought us to that promised land as yet. More recent endeavors, which have involved placing large sums of money into particular centers to carry on continuous research in depth, have not yet justified the confidence that many people had that, given this kind of opportunity, educational research would demonstrate its worth. On the whole, in the context of a college, whether an inner or cluster college in a larger institution or a free standing institution, it seems unlikely that the demands of the rigorous experimenter [or the] statistical measurements oriented evaluator can be satisfied. One deals with convenience samples rather than with random samples, with quasi-experiments rather than real experiments, and when attempts are made to set up matched groups, the adjective "matched" is advisedly placed in quotes.[1]

The overall methodological approach of the present study is made with the spirit of Dressel's comments very much in mind.

More specifically, the self-study model evolved will be presented within the framework of categories utilized for the more traditional self-study model. It should be emphasized at the outset, nonetheless, that this framework is merely taken as a point of departure whose adequacies within the

---

[1]Paul L. Dressel, "The Problem of Evaluation," in The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal, ed. Paul L. Dressel (Iowa City, Ia.: The American College Testing Program and The American Association for Higher Education, 1972), p. 16.

context of non-traditional education will in fact be part of the continuing discussion generating the new model. The ten standards serve as benchmarks for analysis as well as points of departure (see Appendix A, p. 93, for capsulized descriptions of each standard). The ten standards involved are as follows:

I. Purpose
II. Organization and Administration
III. Educational Program
IV. Financial Resources
V. Faculty
VI. Library
VII. Student Development Services
VIII. Physical Plant
IX. Special Activities
X. Graduate Program

These standards derive from the institutional self-study model of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, as described, along with discussions of underlying philosophy and administrative mechanisms, in two of that body's publications.[1]

For the Walden University case study, material was collected by means of participant observation, personal

---

[1]Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Manual for the Institutional Self-Study Program of the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972); Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Standards of the College Delegate Assembly (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972).

interviews with appropriate administrative staff, faculty, and students, and examination of relevant documentation, published and unpublished.

The Study Model

The method adopted in the following discussion will be to proceed sequentially, standard by standard, until the general outline of the non-traditional study model is evolved. The overall structure of this model will then be discussed as an entity at the conclusion of this presentation.

Standard I: Purpose

In the case of this and ensuing standards, the method of discussion will be to present material pertaining to Walden, to consider to what extent that material can be covered under routine standard evaluations, and to suggest new evaluative standards as appropriate to cover the non-traditional elements involved.

The purpose of Walden University emerges clearly from a survey of published and unpublished material (including documents of the Purpose Committee) and from interviews with University officials. It is to provide an alternative organizational framework of scholarly excellence through which advanced students of education can achieve their research and degree objectives in association with experienced and sensitive teacher-advisors and within minimun residence requirements. There are two main objectives, therefore. The first, stemming from the belief that students

who have gone beyond the master's degree are capable of independent study, aims at providing a calendar within which such study may be accomplished, subject to agreed-upon guidelines and continued advisement and coupled with intensive association with leading professors and educational practitioners in a one-month summer session. The second objective aims at setting standards of excellence in research, represented in dissertations and projects, accomplished within this context, that are at least equal to those produced by conventional doctoral processes.

Walden University maintains that its processes should be judged not by conformance to an existing pattern, but by results; that is, in contributions to educational research and improvement of educational capabilities in teaching, administration, and related educational activities.

Two questions naturally arise: (1) how do conventional self-study standards apply to such an unconventional establishment? and (2) how, if those standards are inadequate, should fresh evaluative mechanisms be structured?

The conventional standard for self-study is predicated, it appears, on a static and categorizing theoretical model. An initial statement of purpose is judged to have been made; evaluation of that statement places heavy emphasis on the fact that it should be adhered to by differing components of the institution (thus implicitly assuming that such unity cannot necessarily exist de novo); and the matter of projections for the future, and changes in purpose is considered

in such a manner as to indicate that the factor of change is regarded as a deviation--even if a necessary one--from a static norm of original purpose.[1] Again, the traditional model appears unable to come to grips with a situation where change is built into basic function and purpose, as is the case at Walden.

What new elements may therefore be considered when making a self-study evaluation of the purpose of a non-traditional institution? The first point that must be made is that, inasmuch as a non-traditional body may lay heavy emphasis on its flexibility and adaptability, such a body must take particular care to state its philosophy of change and indeed its overall purpose in extensive and explicitly formulated terms. A direct result will be to ensure that policies of, say, drift and indecision, to say nothing of wrong policies, cannot be allowed to detract from the underlying innovative purpose of the institution by masquerading as adaptability and commitment to change--although it will be expected that such bodies will take a more liberal attitude toward experimentation.

The problem of evaluating success in pursuing the goals stated in the underlying philosophy of purpose must also be faced and stated. Clearly, if the stated aim is to produce

---

[1] See, for example, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Manual for the Institutional Self-Study Program of the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (Atlanta, Ga.: Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972), passim; and Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Standards of the College Delegate Assembly (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972), passim.

work measuring up to the highest professional standards, then adequate outside professional assessment, not least in response to published material, must be welcomed. Studies can also be made of alumni advancement in career terms for evaluative purposes. But emphasis must also be given to qualitative evaluations of how participants in non-traditional institutions feel that they have or have not benefited from taking part in innovative areas of study and research. In sum, therefore, evaluations of purpose from the self-study viewpoint must recognize that an institution whose purpose partly incorporates constant re-examination of that purpose cannot be judged in static, categorical, or bureaucratically-oriented terminologies and concepts. Further, an institution that emphasizes a subtle blending of theory and practice cannot be judged in terms of a contextual emphasis on static goal-setting and goal-reaching. This is not to say that adequate evaluations of purpose cannot be made through precise and rigorous formulation and reformulation of underlying philosophy via mechanisms that embrace all levels of the non-traditional institution--staff, faculty, and students. The experience of Walden has shown that such ongoing discussions--the norm at the institution--are in fact an ongoing evaluation of purpose in themselves.

All evidence gathered on Walden seems to indicate that the philosophy most subscribed to at the institution is one that considers self-motivated, self-directed learning to be the most significant means of achieving quality education.

Carl Rogers, when considering learning facilities and methods used to provide a climate conducive to quality education, explains it this way:

> "The evaluation of one's own learning is one of the major means by which self-initiated learning becomes also responsible learning. It is when the individual has to take the responsibility for deciding what criteria are important to him, what goals he has been trying to achieve, and the extent to which he has achieved those goals, that he truly learns to take responsibility for himself and his directions . . . ."[1]

Traditional institutions take the approach of leaving the student on the receiving end entirely, with little room for input and decision making. Walden is moving away from that concept.

> Learning is facilitated when the student participates responsibility in the learning situation. When he chooses his own directions, helps to discover his own learning resources, formulates his own problems, decides own course of action, lives with the consequences of those choices; then significant learning is maximized . . . ."[2]

Indeed, as far as comparison with traditional evaluative standards is concerned, it might even be suggested that the entire process of an institution like Walden may well be covered only by Standard Nine (concerning Special Activities) if those traditional mechanisms are to be observed. The key to a successful non-traditional self-study model, as far as purpose is concerned, is therefore the recognition that purpose is not a given, but rather a component of short-,

---

[1]Carl Rogers, Freedom to Learn (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrel Publishing Co., 1969), pp. 142-143.

[2]Ibid., p. 162.

middle-, and long-term change and adaptation; it will be evaluated by ongoing, institution-wide discussion. Qualitative factors relating to the enhanced humanity of the participants, as well as the legitimate normal panoply of quantitative evaluation of success in relation to goals--professional recognition, excellence of performance, and so on--can also play a role. All these factors must be given rigorous but flexible attention in the construction of the self-study model appropriate to individual non-traditional institutions.

Standard II: Organization and Administration

The organizational and administrative mechanisms centered on Walden are a direct expression of that institution's underlying philosophy and purpose. As a result, the actual administrative structure is geared to both a limited campus experience (the summer session) and the non-residency aspect of Walden--as compared with more traditional bodies--also allows for a flexible administrative environment and an acceptance of the philosophy of change as part of the basic nature of that environment. An internal document emanating from the Executive Vice-President at Walden, and describing the functions of that position, is illustrative of that approach. Extracts from that document follow:

> The Executive Vice-President at Walden is responsible to and for a variety of University Operations: the Library, the Registrar and Admissions Offices, and the Office of University Relations, which is concerned with public information . . . Because [these agencies] all function within the context

> of an institution that is new in concept as well as chronology, they are all feeling their way, searching for that which best fits their own special contributions to the overall mission of Walden as a genuine option, solid and innovative, in American higher education. Like the University itself, these units of it are very much in process, in a state of "becoming" rather than "being." May they stay that way . . . ![1]

This state of "becoming" rather than "being" is reflected in the overall administrative mechanisms at Walden. The general function is to service the doctoral fellows and doctoral candidates at Walden and to do so in a shared community of scholars. Thus the organization of the Board of Directors and the Board of Advisors leads, through the respective Deans of Advisement and of the Summer Program, into such areas as the responsibilities of Regional Directors (East, Central, and West) and, through them, the Adjunct Faculty and Review Committees that guide the doctoral candidates' independent study and, similarly, through curriculum and faculty areas related to the summer session.

Members of the Resident Summer Faculty "hold full-time appointments for the doctoral residency program."[2] The summer faculty members hold full-time academic or administrative appointments during the remainder of the year at colleges and universities in other parts of the country. Thus, because of its unique design, the Walden program, and especially the summer residency session, can avail itself of

---

[1] Unpublished document, Walden University, made available to author.

[2] Ibid., p. 7.

the services of highly qualified and broadly talented academic scholars and leaders. Selected partly on the basis of experience and ability in academic and personal counseling, the faculty members are housed with their families on Walden's Cove Campus during the summer session.

As a result of this wider arrangement, the administrative full-time nucleus of the University can be kept at a minimal and unbureaucratic level, subject, within the broad legal framework of the proprietary institution, to constant evaluation subject to change at any practicable moment.

Such an administration obviously raises questions of fundamental principles when judged against the more traditional context of Standard II of the existing self-study model. It is noteworthy that the existing model standard places heavy emphasis on the necessity for understanding roles and for evaluative communications within what is implicitly regarded as a static, bureaucratic model. The constant emphasis on the necessity for change again precludes consideration of a situation where change is not only welcomed, but is built into the educational and administrative structure.

What changes, then, are necessary in evolving a non-traditional self-study model? Obviously, the requirements of the traditional model regarding delineations of basic administrative structure and other factors must be retained. The key new element would be a recognition of the factor of change as a major component of the non-traditional system,

the minimal nature of bureaucratic procedures, and the elimination of much of the traditional administrative apparatus associated with a year-round residency requirement. Such functions as the administration of complex educational policies, personnel procedures, and general operations; of cumbersome supporting services for students; of faculty manpower utilization rules and regulations; and of massive academic budgets are simplified or dispensed with. Evaluation is, however, built into such an innovative system primarily through the continued use of built-in, regular self-evaluation sessions and small group discussions. In Walden's case, the self-evaluation process as described emerges naturally as an outgrowth of the sense of fellowship fostered among students at the University. ". . . Shared commitment . . . continues to motivate all . . . as a community of seekers interested in research and in how their efforts can lead to social change and educational betterment."[1] Formal encouragement furthers the process; interest groups, or mini-courses, bring together small groups in scheduled meetings. Candidates for degrees may select the mini-courses they wish to attend from a range of choices including such diverse subject areas as "Experimental College Programs," "The Urban School," and "The Humanist and Values."

Standard III: Educational Program

The educational program is obviously at the core of

[1] Ibid., p. 7.

the Walden experience, and, despite its limitation to doctoral experiences in the educational field, some general points regarding non-traditional education and its evaluation may be raised.

Firstly, in line with the policy of the "University without Walls" that views the typical degree candidate as a competent and experienced professional, requirements for admission are flexible and yet precise (the basic requirements are set out in tabular form in Appendix B., p. 97). The likelihood that degree candidates would tend to utilize known principles to explicate practical situations is acknowledged, and, as Appendix B also indicates, "graduate work taken at other recognized institutions may be applied toward the doctoral degree program at Walden . . . ."[1]

Secondly, and crucially, the Walden program is based on three assumptions: (1) that teachers and learners can effectively participate in a series of educational programs which are both mutually rewarding and of service to the larger society; (2) that the individual participant will commit himself to humanizing the educational process, and (3) that learning stems from inner motivation and self-discipline, implying responsibility to profession and to society in general. In addition, the evaluative component of the Walden experience is enhanced in two key aspects: the emphasis on research methodology and high standards during the summer residency session and the advisement mechanisms

---

[1]Ibid., p. 19.

of the non-residential portions of the doctoral program. Regarding the latter, it should be noted that during the summer residency session each individual student has an advisor who works with, and counsels, the student on a repetitive basis; the student prepares a proposal for a doctoral dissertation under his advisor's tutelage and with the latter's aid; and in two subsequent off-campus semesters of effort following the summer session, carries through his research project. Typically, the latter is accomplished "under the advisement of a scholar who possesses an earned doctorate."[1] In some cases, the advisement services of a recognized expert in a particular field may be provided for the candidate. In this regard, too, an unpublished Walden document notes a remedy for a possible weakness in non-traditional educational processes:

> Walden's three-fold approach--locally, regionally, and nationally--to the advisement procedure is aimed at obtaining the quality of critical judgement necessary for the attainment of academic excellence at the doctoral level. The role of constructive evaluation and quality control may be too often overlooked in an innovative and flexible program. This goal can only be accomplished by all those who are involved in and are responsible for the process itself. (Emphasis added)[2]

To the greatest extent possible, the goal is achieved at Walden on a one-to-one basis that ensures continuation of the motivational drive so important to success in high-level educational endeavors. Though no "course sequence," as such,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 52.

[2] Unpublished document, Walden University, made available to author.

has been established, the fall and spring educational research courses "cannot be initiated until topic approval (for the dissertation) is obtained."[1] This usually occurs by the end of the summer session if an original area of investigation has been determined, the problem identified, and the method of investigation satisfactorily approved by the faculty. Afterward the control mechanism involves at least the following steps:

1. When the candidate and his advisor feel the dissertation manuscript is ready for presentation to the two-man Review Committee, the candidate contacts his Regional Coordinator who makes the necessary arrangements.

2. The advisor signs the dissertation title page, indicating his approval, whereupon one copy of the manuscript and abstract is submitted to the Regional Coordinator.

3. The Regional Coordinator checks the manuscript; and, if he finds it acceptable, he approves it and directs the candidate to send one copy each of the manuscript and abstract to each member of the Review Committee.

4. The members of the Review Committee evaluate the dissertation on such criteria as timeliness, scholarliness, usability, and originality, afterward characterizing it as "acceptable with no revisions," "acceptable with revisions," or "unacceptable."

5. Once the dissertation has been termed acceptable, with or without revisions, the candidate sends two copies of

[1] Ibid., p. 22.

the manuscript, the abstract, and the Review Committee's evaluations to the Dean of Advisement, whose responsibility it is to provide final approval.[1]

How can a process of education so unique in the overall be judged by the relevant standard evolved to meet the requirements of a traditional institution? The most important area where new criteria would have to be devised, it appears, is that of evaluating what might be termed the "long distance" aspects of the "University without Walls" character of such institutions. The Walden model of advisement structure, containing as it does built-in safeguards guiding the doctoral candidate toward successful completion of his program, as well as self-checking mechanisms involving impartial outside opinions, might well be utilized by non-residential institutions generally as an effective adjunct to the evaluative process of their self-study. The other main area where non-traditional self-studies must necessarily deviate from the traditional model is in the matter of built-in program evaluations emanating from the very nature of an innovative, shared, and flexible curriculum; discussion and comparison are, literally, built into the Walden system as a result of the "mini-courses" and their methodology.

Standard IV: Financial Resources

Walden is a proprietary institution. Partly as a result, Walden is relatively small in comparison with other educational

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 24-25.

institutions. Thus the full panoply of financial controls required of larger, more traditional bodies is not appropriate, although good financial control does exist and financial statements are made to conform to recommendations established by the American Council on Education. Walden also functions as a single department, and all funds received have been from its original capitalization, student fees, and from interest income. The present size of Walden University does not require, nor does the program offered make it advisable to maintain, a complex budgeting system; the budget is currently prepared by the University President, approved by the Board of Directors, and administered by the President and staff assistants. An annual audit is performed by a Certified Public Accountant. As a matter of course, upon accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the Walden auditing practices would be adjusted to the standards and procedures established by the Association.

The Walden budget is shaped by the fact that enrollments have been and are expected to remain stable. In 1971-72, there were 240 applicants and 140 admissions; for the following years, the corresponding figures were (1972-73) applications 400, admissions 157; (1973-74) applications 300, admissions 154; and (1974-75) applications 350, admissions 160.

According to school officials, new programs are currently in the very earliest stages of advance planning

and may not materialize. It may also be noted that all purchases are made on an "as needed" basis. Quantities of items needed are not of sufficient amounts to provide an advantage of quantity purchasing or warehousing; and the major single budgetary item other than salaries, wages, and consultant fees is for space rent.

How does the Walden experience in this respect compare with that apparently envisaged in traditional self-study models, and what lessons does it hold for the evolution of a non-traditional self-study model?

Although there are areas where the categories of the traditional self-study model may be carried over--notably in the utilization of the American Council on Education audit guidelines--it is clear that the traditional Standard IV is designed for a large and inflexibly organized institution. There is emphasis on the existence of a business office and its interrelationships with the internal structure of the institution. The standard is also concerned with external finance sources, including those at the state or federal government level. Obviously, much of this material is superfluous for a non-traditional model on the Walden order, where the President can assume virtually the entire responsibility for financial matters within the charter guidelines.

Standard V: Faculty

Because of its unique character, Walden is able to recruit its summer faculty from the entire American academic world. Faculty members possess earned doctorates and are

highly respected in their professional fields. The Dean of the Summer Session for 1973, for example, was Dr. Harold L. Hodgkinson, Project Director at the Berkeley Center for Research and Development in Higher Education of the University of California and President of the American Association for Higher Education. Advisors are similarly well qualified. A Faculty Handbook and summer organizational sessions introduce faculty members to the Walden environment, and faculty members are equal in rank. The nature of the Walden environment makes it imperative that each faculty member be utilizing study and research to continue his education and academic growth. It should be emphasized that Walden's pay rates more than match the highest rates at accredited universities or for summer sessions, using official American Association of University Professors' data.[1] The actual summer teaching experience emphasizes group teaching and the utilization of small group sessions. Finally, it may be noted that professional security considerations are not applicable because of Walden's unique nature.

---

[1] An unpublished Walden University document made available to the author cites the salary of full-time summer faculty as "$2,000 per month (usually the month of July)," with expenses covering housing and travel for faculty and family. The comparability cited is indicated in that document as follows: " . . . The justification as presented is taken from the most recent reports released by the American Association of University Professors . . . As can be seen by referring to Column 6 on Pages 204 and 206, the pay on highest rank ranges from $13,000 to $23,400 per year. If a pro rated scale of monthly pay based upon a ten month or twelve month year is used, Walden's $2,000 per month pay scale more than matches the highest rate of pay among those accredited universities." Faculty, unpublished Walden University document, undated.

The traditional self-study model covers the main points of interest concerning faculty and faculty evaluation as outlined above; but it is quite clear that the "University without Walls" aspect of Walden both eliminates the need for certain areas of the self-study--notably in the areas of year-round organization, professional security, and detailed teaching and work-load scheduling and evaluation--and adds new dimensions for self-study. Probably the most significant of these is the opportunity to attract and utilize the talents of first-class scholars and teachers who share the innovative Walden philosophy of education. Because of this, the continuing search for such faculty must be very carefully planned, and must also be nation-wide in scope. Any comparable self-study model must see to it that the maximum effectiveness is demonstrated for the mechanisms used. At the least standards of selection must be applied, and continuing standards of excellence encouraged, that will ensure perpetuation of the innovative philosophy at all levels, and most notably at the faculty level.

The question of evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and the doctoral research assistance over a relatively short period of time is obviously one which must be given greater attention than in a traditional self-study model, where more long-term approaches are the norm, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Evaluations can nevertheless be undertaken, as the alumni survey presented later in this study will demonstrate, insofar as student

judgments of the effectiveness of faculty members at Walden can be made. The quality of doctoral work produced is in part a reflection of faculty effectiveness, but probably to a lesser degree than in traditional equivalents because of both the time factor and the Walden emphasis on self-generated educational advancement.

Standard-VI: Library

Walden University library facilities are a reflection of the overall objectives of the institution and are thus geared to the short summer residency session. In the main, they cater to the needs of individuals engaged in general studies of educational problems raised in the group sessions, and also to research relating to research methodology and the choice, but not the execution, of doctoral dissertations and special projects in the field of education. Thus complicated cataloguing, very wide collections relating to the field of study in depth, and similar materials are quite superfluous to the needs of a summer residency program of the Walden type.

Far more pertinent is the library concept as brought to realization at Walden. In essence, the Cove Campus library constitutes a "portable basic reference room," hopefully one "that can be replicated by other alternative educational models at various levels."[1] Thus the library's three rooms--two reading rooms plus a combination shelfing/

[1] Ibid., p. 26.

reading area--provide an effective alternative to the basic, static university library format. Housed in a separate building, the library remains open daily from 8 a.m. until 11 p.m.*

> The core of the library is a collection of about 1,000 primary research tools which have been selected to permit the candidate, during the course of the preparation of his proposal, to explore such avenues of research as his own proposal will require. It is not the purpose of the library to provide the tools for research itself since dissertations are never undertaken during the summer session.[1]

The same considerations apply regarding acquisition of special plant and facilities for summer use only. As an internal Walden document notes:

> Just as it would be wasteful and unnecessary to acquire volumes unlikely to be used during the one-month session, so it would be wasteful and unnecessary to construct or lease permanent facilities which are idle for eleven months. The use of off-season facilities, adapted for the purpose, can provide quite adequately . . . .[2]

For the non-residency period of doctoral research, again a unique situation appertains regarding library facilities. As of 1973, Walden was developing plans for utilization of a nation-wide network of key libraries in particular areas of specialization such as Special Education. These libraries would be designated as Walden Adjunct Libraries; their staffs would be available for help during the summer session particularly. Also, well over 500 libraries and

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Unpublished document, Walden University, made available to the author.

resource centers are in use nationally by Walden doctoral candidates during the non-residency part of the program.

Such a unique situation obviously cannot be judged against the corresponding standard in the traditional self-study model. This model is predicated on certain assumptions: a static organizational structure, fixed aims, and a year-round residency.

If a self-study model is to be evolved that will adequately meet the requirements of a non-traditional institution, then it must obviously adopt different criteria. The main area of evaluation must be the basic philosophy of the library as it relates to the non-traditional and innovative aims of the institution, and in such areas the question of non-residency and research specialization must loom large. Such libraries must be judged in terms of their capacity for use in conjunction with national research and resource facilities in the areas of study involved, of their ability to direct students efficiently to secondary and tertiary areas of information, and of their flexibility in adapting to the needs of a limited residency period in terms of temporary accommodations, efficient management of storage and other facilities, and so on.

Standard VII: Student Development Services

The Student Development Services administrative department at Walden works within the basic humanizing individual and group growth philosophy of the University. In addition, it seeks to meet needs arising from the unique context

within which learning takes place. A major factor obviously stems form the one-month residency requirement, which ensures an intense focus on the summer session, with contacts over the rest of the year being channeled through the Alumni Association. The other major factor stems from the maturity and diversity of Walden's doctoral students; the two factors offer a rich fund of talent and expertise and ease many of the traditional aspects of student personnel work.

The Coordinator of Student Development Services, salaried for the summer session, is enabled to meet with faculty and administration in pre-session planning. Summer activities supervised include a wide range of social functions, often geared to the fact that students will be accompanied by their families. Other matters dealt with include student housing in the Naples area and its relationship to the academic community, availability of student records, recommendations regarding financial aid to students, including deferred payment plans, student health matters (although an on-campus facility is not needed), and, perhaps most important, utilization of the diverse mature professional talent at Walden for formal and informal peer group counseling. An indication of the relevance of Walden to the realities of the contemporary United States is that special efforts are made to cater to the needs of non-white students, bearing in mind that Naples shares many aspects of southern philosophy.

How does this situation compare with the traditional standard of self-study for evaluating student personnel services? While both traditional and non-traditional institutions must of necessity place emphasis on a continuing concern for the total welfare of each student, the unique nature of Walden demonstrates differing mechanisms, and hence different evaluative methods, in approaching this goal. Thus administration in the traditional body must obviously be concerned with the year-round situation, a large student body, measures of freedom for students that are associated with the youth of students and questions relating to the school's in loco parentis status, and a whole range of matters relating to non-academic activities, notably athletics, fraternity organizations, year-round student groupings, discipline, complex recording systems, financial aid, housing and health services, and so on.

What, then, should a non-traditional institution offer in this area? Key factors again are flexibility; the need to key student services to an innovative, graduate school environment; and the ability to focus intensively on a limited-time student residency period outside the normal range of experience. Much thought and pre-planning must obviously go into ensuring that the activities in the concentrated summer session are effective and well organized, and that activities are geared to the needs of a mature, specialized group of scholars who are often well advanced professionally. Evaluation of this system can rest in large

measure on feedback from the student body itself, since the standing and professional talents of this group will provide an articulate and built-in process of checks and balances.

Standard VIII: Physical Plant

The Walden rationale concerning physical plant is adequately summarized in an unpublished internal document on this matter:

> It would be wasteful and unnecessary (creating a financial burden on the student to support idle facilities for eleven months through inflated tuition charges) to build or lease a year-round plant, when the student body is "on campus" for only one month of the year. Lease of off-season facilities adaptable to University needs is the sensible and economical answer.[1]

The rationale behind this approach is clear. Walden needs year-round plant only for central administration purposes. The summer facilities consist of two buildings leased by the University--a fully adequate lecture hall and a conference hall and library (including a private seminar room and a lobby area with restrooms and other facilities)--while the year-round lease covers a reception area, a Registrar and Records office, and a President's office. Housing accommodation is provided either at the adjacent motel facilities themselves or in nearby motels and apartments. It is to be noted that the motel providing leased quarters is fully equipped for, and provides all maintenance and insurance on, buildings and facilities leased. Also,

[1]Unpublished document, Walden University, made available to the author.

there is adequate provision for student feedback on facility adequacy, and future plans are flexible enough to include such possibilities as leasing the same facilities for an additional session in August and constructing a permanent office facility. Perhaps most significant, the University retains the option to meet any inadequacies in facilities or services simply by shifting to another leased facility, one comparable to the present location, or to a university or college facility not used in the summer months.

Such flexibility--the dramatic option to uproot and move the entire institution with maximum flexibility and minimal inconvenience--heightens the contrast between the non-traditional educational body and the traditional institution. Again, it is equally clear that the evaluative mechanisms evolved with reference to the latter cannot be applied in any meaningful sense to the former. New criteria must be established. The traditional standard, for example, lays heavy emphasis on inventories of existing facilities, maintenance problems, and plans for plant development, always a thorny problem for traditional urban universities located in decaying areas and surrounded by poor neighborhoods whose inhabitants are not necessarily kindly disposed to expanding facilities in view of their own desperate housing needs. Interlocking with financial questions in the traditional institution is the whole problem of capital investment and strain on total educational resources.

Standards IX and X: Special Activities and the Graduate Program

The unique nature of Walden makes feasible discussion of these two Standards as a unit. For Walden *in toto* is an expression of a "Special Activity" of the kind normally considered as a possibly experimental adjunct to a traditional body; and its whole educational thrust is, indeed, at the graduate level: that is, doctoral study in education.

Walden as an institution, or as the embodiment of an innovative approach to graduate education, clearly resembles the special, non-traditional, operationally separate unit envisioned under Standard IX. Its objectives, methods of operation, forms, and products are those which might be undertaken by a separate college in association with a parent institution. But Walden is an independent unit, *not* one dependent on a benevolent "parent" organization that maintains control of finances and may well have coopting designs on the achievements of its subsidiary.

> . . . there has been a call for independent experiments which can operate in a "pure" environment and which must prove themselves by judgments of their very different system and its results. Having carefully devised an alternate mode, and special methods within it, Walden hopes to be judged by its success in accomplishing its objectives, rather than by the degree of its conformance to existing patterns . . . .[1]

The Walden graduate program, organized as it is around the concept of a "University without Walls" and specializing in the area of education only, is much less complex than those of larger, more traditional institutions. Because

---

[1] Unpublished document, Walden University, made available to author.

of the summer session procedure, the faculty is drawn from all areas of academic life and from across the United States; members are very highly qualified compared to the faculty members of traditional bodies. The graduate faculty consists of a dean and six other doctoral professors who function as the faculty and as advisors to the students during the summer program. Dissertation advisors are secured individually by the students and they, along with the faculty and regional advisors, all possessors of doctorates, serve as the Review Board for all dissertations.

A Generic Self-Study Model for Non-Traditional Institutions

Certain salient concepts about education emerge from the preceding investigation of illustrative facets of Walden University. The general ten-point category can be expanded into a vigorous, yet flexible, model for use as a device to measure the capacities of other non-traditional institutions. The generic, self-study model set forth here serves as a point of reference which can lead to the upgrading of Walden or any other similar institution. It is intended to serve as a first approximation of such a model. It is necessary, however, to point to an obvious governing factor that has a bearing on the practical value of such a model: because of the wide diversity of non-traditional institutions, the phrase "where applicable" must be held to apply throughout to specific formulations. Nevertheless, an attempt has been made to make the model as comprehensive as possible, although

flexibility in potential application cannot, of course, be stressed enough, as flexibility is often the key factor underlying the structure and function of non-traditional bodies.

The Model: Schematic Outline

I. Purpose

A. The Non-Traditional Educational Philosophy

1. External differentiation

What, specifically, differentiates the non-traditional institution from related traditional institutions, regionally and nationally? Is the educational philosophy pursued, for example, dynamic as opposed to static, non-categorizing as opposed to categorizing, personal rather than impersonal, present-oriented rather than future or past-oriented, with human values rather than bureaucratic quantification the basic yardstick? Does the non-traditional institution believe in a philosophy at all, espousing instead an unstructured pragmatic approach? This process of comparison and contrast should serve to mark off the basic parameters of the non-traditional philosophical approach.

2. Internal differentiation

How does this philosophy find internal expression within the non-traditional institution? How does this institution differ, philosophically, from other non-traditional bodies?

(a) Overall philosophic approach

Is this:

(i) structured and holistic? or
(ii) unstructured, pragmatic, avoiding overall theoretical expression?

(b) Change and adaptation

How does the philosophy of the institution relate to the goals of dynamic change and adaptation, and what weight, respectively, is given to

(i) short-term
(ii) medium-term
(iii) long-term change?

(c) Experimentation

Willingness on the part of the institution to try new techniques, expand its concept of learning and education; flirt with new approaches and abandon generally used principles in favor of new, possibly untried ones.

What attitudes are expressed in the philosophy towards experimentation? Is it given light or heavy emphasis? Is failure as well as success given due attention?

(d) Discarded innovative patterns

What attitudes are expressed towards patterns of innovation that have been discarded?

(e) Successful innovative patterns

What attitudes are expressed towards successful innovative patterns? What, specifically, is the philosophical attitude towards the establishment of a "tried and tested" pattern? What degree of philosophical "risk" is allowed to an innovation in order for it to demonstrate possibly "late-blooming" success trends rather than a "slow-but-steady" approach?

3. Values

What weight does the philosophy of the institution give to non-quantitative philosophical factors? Are "happiness" and "good feelings" given philosophical weight greater than abstract logical processes? Are conflict and disputation--even displays of anger and emotion--welcomed as part of the overall philosophy? Is the overall value system open and dynamic, as opposed to closed and static? Do all members of the institution share equally in this value system, or does the philosophy hold that certain hierarchies and restraints are necessary--e.g., the values of faculty as opposed to students?

B. Roles adopted to express the Non-Traditional Educational Philosophy

1. The structural and organizational framework

(a) The alternative organization

What vehicle has been adopted to express the overall educational philosophy cited? Is the institution intended to be fixed permanently in one location, or peripatetic? Are the students to be resident or non-resident or partially resident? What size has been selected as best expressing the philosophy of the institution? Is growth regarded as a built-in function of the organization structure, or as an undesirable phenomenon?

(b) What educational areas and goals give organizational expression to the underlying philosophy? If there has been a concentration on, or an exclusion of, undergraduate and graduate study, why has this role been adopted? Does the selection of subjects to be covered by the institution have a specific relationship to the underlying philosophy?

(c) Is there a heavy organizational emphasis on facilitating the independent study process by students, and do student roles in this respect express the underlying non-traditional philosophy?

2. The role of evaluation

(a) General - How does the non-traditional philosophy express itself in the organizational role played in the institution by the evaluative process? Is there a built-in evaluative process, and what is its relative organizational weight? What organizational role is played in the process by

(i) administrators
(ii) faculty
(iii) students

singly and in varying combination?

(b) Specific - In what ways are traditional quantitative methodologies of evaluation

utilized, if at all, in the non-traditional context? Similarly, how are evaluations of qualitative factors, or "how people feel," given organizational expression in the institution? What roles, respectively, do present students, faculty, and administrators play in determining the purpose of evaluation, and with what degree of frequency do the organizational expressions of evaluation take place? For purposes of evaluation, does the institution regard itself as functioning in competition with traditional bodies or other non-traditional institutions?

C. Summary

A summary recapitulation of the answers given throughout this preceding area should provide the basic answer to the question "What, in theory and in practice, is the uniquely non-traditional purpose of this institution."

II. Organization and Administration

A. General

1. Describe the static organizational and administrative apparatus of the institution, giving overall administrative positions and responsibilities, the chain of command and responsibility, and the interrelationship of subunits within the system.

2. Describe the dynamic aspects of the system. How does the organizational system gear itself to change and innovation at a level adequate to the non-traditional philosophy of the institution? How much is this adaptability a function of size? Are positions interchangeable and liable to expansion and consolidation according to changing needs? What provisions are there for shared decision-making and response to internal feedback?

B. Specific functions

1. The nuclear facility. How does the organization and administration of the institution represent an adaptation to the specific requirements of a non- or intermittently-residential institution? What organizational "weight" does this nuclear

facility have in relationship to the entire administration, including off-campus, non-residential aspects? How are the problems of "starting-up" and "winding-down" a summer residency program given appropriate and effective administrative expression? Similarly, how are the functions relating to the intensive nature of a short residential session handled? Specifically, what administrative provisions are there for making immediate short-term changes to meet the exigencies of an intensive short residential session? How is an apt balance maintained between the necessary static and the necessary dynamic organizational factors maintained at the nuclear facility? How is continuity preserved in the organization, and what degree of importance is attached to it?

2. The campus facility. How does the organizational and administrative system respond to the off-campus needs of students and faculty? How is organizational continuity and contact retained in coherent form when a wide geographical network may be involved? Given this widespread distribution of, say, advisors, faculty, and students, how is the non-traditional face-to-face emphasis on human values maintained? What are the static and the dynamic aspects of the off-campus system of organization, and what is the degree and nature of contact between members of the institution? What arrangements, if any, are made to make partial use of other organizational facilities, traditional, adapted traditional, or non-traditional in origin, on an "as needed" basis, and how is this element of organization fitted into the whole in a dynamic fashion?

3. Individual departments and administrative categories. How, within the framework outlined above, do individual departments and categories of administration function efficiently? Is communication more important than organization, adaptability more than formal function? If sub-categories of administration are able to expand or contract in order to take over or relinquish the functions of related areas at different times, describe the process and

its component sequences. How structured are they? What provision is made for the unexpected? For conflict within the whole system? How is the flow of information, decision-making, and feedback made in each area, and how does it fit into the whole?

III. Educational Program and Educational Process

A. General

1. What factors have governed the selection of particular subject areas, and levels of study or research, in keeping with the institution's non-traditional philosophy? What steps are taken to review such commitments as have been made in this area in the light of the development of new subject areas, and of changes in the content of established areas because of the ever-expanding "knowledge explosion"? How is the dynamic component of the educational program adapted to changes in this area?

2. In cases where more than one area of study is explored in the institution, what related steps have been taken within specific subject areas? What advance planning is there in this respect, and who participates in it, both within the institution and outside?

B. Research methodology and evaluation of same

What is the relationship between the institution and the wider field of learning, locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally, specifically in the design of research methodologies and areas of investigation and communication of new knowledge? Specifically, what roles are played by the nuclear facility, and the off-campus component of the institution, particularly the advisement structure, in this respect?

C. Mutual participation by students and teachers

How is the educational program molded to accommodate the mutual participation by students and teachers that characterizes non-traditional approaches? Does this delay or enhance the learning process, and what evidence is there to support the latter contention? What opportunities are there for intellectual cross-fertilization between students and teachers in different disciplines,

and what is the rationale for such procedures? How is effectiveness in this whole area monitored and assessed by the participants and what criteria (quantitative and qualitative) are used in the process?

D. Humanization of the learning process

What specific evidence is there of the application of the non-traditional goal of humanizing the learning process to the institution's educational program and educational process? What, for example, are the classroom or seminar procedures involved? Is team teaching utilized? To which level of the class concerned is the educational process geared? How does the overall structure relate to the individual student and to specific sub-categories of student--for example, minority students, female students, slower or more advanced students--in a way that is both humanizing and effective, and what evaluative measures are utilized to check on this process? Is the provision of a "good atmosphere" and/or "good student-teacher relations" detrimental to measured academic achievement, or does it enhance same? By what measure--quantitative or qualitative?

E. Inner motivation and the learning process

By what processes and methods are the non-traditional goals of learning from inner-motivation and self-discipline applied to the educational program? How is the capacity of the individual student for self-motivation encouraged and measured? To what degree is this process a matter of trust, and to what degree is it subject to investigation and evaluation? What role does the student himself play in this evaluation? In the case of non-residency periods in the program, what checks and evaluative mechanisms are used to determine the motivation of the student? If problems in this area occur, what channels are used to facilitate a solution, and how much of that solution is left to the individual student? What steps are taken to ensure that the non-resident student is working unaided and not utilizing other resources rather than using his individual judgment and knowledge in producing work? How is the inner motivation of teachers and administrators assessed, evaluated, and, if necessary, enhanced? How much, if any, regulation or supervision does the institution employ in this area, and who is responsible? What opportunities are there for feedback

discussions on problems encountered in the individual learning process?

1. Suggest using the semantic differential method of measuring the inner-motivation and the learning process. A select group of students would be used to establish the basis of trust in the ability of the institution to instill a sense of responsibility in the graduate program. The extremes would be strongly motivated and highly unmotivated. A difference of ten degrees would exist between the two extremes, and students would be asked to place themselves in relation to their conception of the university's ability to motivate at either extreme on the scale, or as close to the extreme as they would fall. The results of the measurement would be provided to the institution so that it can be made aware of how the student views--attitude-wise--the inner motivation created at the institution. The semantic differential would be developed to contain two sections--one to measure trust in the institution's ability to motivate and the other the actual degree of motivation felt by the student in relation to his academic and personal growth.

IV. Financial Resources

A. Size and the financial operation

Is the size of the non-traditional institution such as to obviate the need for an extensive business office department? If so, how is the responsibility for financial matters distributed in the overall organization? Given the innovative structure of the institution, what overall attempts have been made to see that the financial apparatus conforms to the general practice of shared responsibility and democratic give-and-take within the institution?

B. Budget preparation and audit procedures

Within the flexible framework of the non-traditional institution, what procedures have been adopted to ensure adequate financial and accounting procedures that are specially equipped to deal with the rapid changes of direction that may be expected in a dynamic organization? What steps have been taken to enable the fullest possible participation in

budgetary planning? Specifically, what roles do students, faculty, and administrators play in this process? How is the need to ensure democratic participation in budgetary planning reconciled with the necessity to make quick decisions should the occasion warrant it? Once a budget is approved, what procedures have been adopted to permit changes in spending patterns and related outlays because of changed educational needs? How is this overall flexibility of approach evaluated internally?

C. Income

What sources of income does the institution have at its disposal? Are these sources such as to permit a flexible financial pattern, with associated fluctuations in expenditure? Are contributors, for example, fully cognized of the flexible nature of the institution, specifically, of the need for experimentation and of the possibility of the failure of some experimental projects? How does the flexibility of the institution affect the balance between capital and current income, and what provisions have been made to provide full corresponding flexibility in these areas?

D. Expenditures

Is the size and nature of the non-traditional institution such as to minimize expenditure on expensive permanent plant and facilities, and maximize expenditure on wages, salaries, etc.? Specifically, is space rented rather than owned? Is the need for warehousing obviated, and is purchase of materials made on an "as needed" basis? How is the balance maintained between the necessity for a flexible approach, particularly as regards "as needed" expenditures, and proper financial controls? What special evaluative procedures have been developed in this area? Is the nature of the institution such as to permit a lessening of expenditure in certain areas without loss of quality due to the existence of various volunteered or donated services, e.g., in the teaching area? If so, how is comparability maintained with traditional and other non-traditional institutions in lieu of a direct cost-comparison basis?

E. New program planning

In the light of the importance given to new program planning in the overall non traditional system, how

is short-, medium-, and long-term financial planning blended into the general planning requirements? How is such planning shared among students, faculty, and other interested parties? What procedures have been adopted to provide continuous re-evaluation in these areas?

V. Faculty

A. General

What relationship is there between the overall structure of the non-traditional institution and the need for faculty? For example, are faculty to be engaged on a full-time or a part-time basis? If the latter, is the seasonal nature of their engagement such as to enable them to maintain full-time positions in other institutions? What consideration has been given to the hiring of faculty whose "life experience" qualifications may be more appropriate to the non-traditional curriculum? If consideration has been given, what evaluative standards are applied in such cases. Whatever the current overall institution-faculty relationship, what contingency and other plans have been made for revisions of that relationship?

B. Recruitment

Further to A. above, are there specific attempts to attract faculty from local and regional sources or is there a concentration on national and international reserves of talent? What specific attempts are made to attract women and minority faculty members? Is there an attempt to get a wide range of faculty from differing backgrounds, including those espousing controversial opinions? If so, how are such faculty evaluated?

C. Work-loads and teaching methods

If the character of the non-traditional institution is such as to involve a concentrated summer residential session, how are the work-loads planned and distributed among faculty for these sessions? How much pre-planning is carried out? What methods are used to overcome the difficulties arising from lack of previous contact between faculty prior to these sessions, in order that the informal and flexible nature of the institution can be enhanced? If adjunct or off-campus faculty are utilized for the remainder of the academic year, what steps are taken

to minimize the impersonal aspects of intermittent and long-distance communication with students, and to enhance flexible and humanized relationships? What methods, on or off campus, are utilized during the teaching process to give expression to the non-traditional educational philosophy? Specifically, are team teaching, seminars, and other small group sessions used in preference to impersonal lectures and one-way imparting of information?

D. Evaluation of teaching methods

Due to the perhaps limited contact with students compared to a traditional institution, even though a summer residency session, for example, may be an intensive teaching and learning experience, what special evaluative procedures have been established to ascertain the efficiency of teaching methods? What weight is given to self-evaluation by faculty; evaluation of faculty by students; and self-evaluation by students as to impact of faculty teaching methods? If group teaching methods are used with input from students as well as faculty, how are such group sessions evaluated?

E. The teaching environment

What is the nature of the teaching environment in relation to plant, library facilities, etc., especially if the faculty are operating in temporary or rented facilities for a summer residency session? Is the environment not only adequate to the normal faculty needs, but is it such as to enhance rather than retard the flexible conditions of a non-traditional environment? How do faculty, students, and administrators compile effective evaluations in this area? How are similar evaluations made for off-campus activities? How do faculty take part in planning for future changes in the structure of the institution, and what special efforts are made to make such changes as smoothly as possible? Are such changes welcomed and made a central part of planning? When changes have been made, how are previous, discarded, experience and experiments evaluated by all concerned?

VI. Library Facilities

A. General

How does the non-traditional philosophy of the institution relate to the need, if any, for library

facilities at the institution? Specifically, what effect does the existence of a nuclear facility and year-round off-campus activity combined with an intensive summer session have on the overall demand for library facilities?

B. Type of library facility

1. On campus. Given the philosophical orientation and the degree of specialization, if any, in subject matter and level of study espoused by the institution, what size and type of library facilities are judged necessary? How does the library cope with the overall philosophy of flexibility, specifically, with the possibility that subject areas may be abandoned in the search for constant relevancy? What facilities are available? How does the access of students and faculty to these facilities and the materials contained within them fit into the informal and flexible nature of the institution? Is the library intended as a permanent or as a portable collection?

2. During the non-residency period of institutional life, what facilities are available to the students in their home location, regionally, or nationally? Are these available as the result of rental or leasing of facilities, or exchange or other arrangements with traditional and other non-traditional institutions? During the non-residency period, how do students and faculty maintain contact with each other in the specific instance of library facility use in order that the shared, informal atmosphere of the institution is maintained? To what extent is the use of telephone and computer systems for the acquisition of information encouraged?

C. Type of material utilized

In what ways does the actual content and type of library materials reflect the degree of specialization at the institution? For example, at a summer residency, at the advanced level, are only those materials related to research methodology and technique needed? Are materials discarded when no longer required? What is the relationship between printed, audio-visual, and other materials? Are microfiche and ultramicrofiche systems used? How are selection procedures evaluated, and by whom?

VII. Student Personnel and Student Activities

A. General

Within the non-traditional framework and philosophy of the institution, how are the needs of students and the responsibilities of the institution for meeting those needs perceived and organized? Is, for example, the age and professional status of the student body such as to obviate the need for many of the *in loco parentis* responsibilities of the institution? How does the existence of a short residency period affect the perceived needs of students? Is pre-planning needed for such activities as intensive summer sessions? Is the situation such that needs of families including offspring have to be met at such sessions? How is overall responsibility in the student services and development area assessed and delegated, and what evaluative procedures are utilized to ensure a correct balance between effectiveness and flexibility?

B. Residency periods

1. Pre-planning. What organization methods are used to ascertain student needs prior to the intensive on-campus experience, and to integrate them into the total planning of the institution? Is a full-time officer and/or a student affairs office needed? How are the characteristics (age, professional status, etc.) of incoming students assessed?

2. In-session activities and responsibility

   How much weight is given during a short residency period to recreational activities, health care, accommodation, and the like insofar as they affect student activities? How is the student body integrated into the general educational environment to ensure a humanizing of values and an informal, unstructured approach appropriate to the non-traditional philosophy? How flexible is the system to accommodate unexpected needs? How is the overall student activity assessed at the end of such sessions, including student participation in overall administration and faculty evaluation?

C. Non-residency periods

How does the institution cater to the needs of students during off-campus work? How are

responsibilities in this area determined, and how far do they overlap with the student's other professional activity and employment? What steps are taken to ascertain student problems during this period of relative isolation from the institution? How is overall student feedback and response evaluated?

VIII. Physical Plant

A. General

What is the perceived need for permanent or temporary physical plant in the light of the overall non-traditional philosophy? Is, for example, the institution conceived of as being peripatetic, temporarily located, or semi-permanent? Specifically, does the institution's function require, basically, owned or leased facilities? Who determines these basic decisions, who is responsible for implementation insofar as plant is concerned, and how are periodic reassessments made and a flexible planning approach ensured?

B. Specific responsibilities

Within this general framework, is responsibility for such matters as inventories, maintenance, plant development, capital investment, and the like shared by the institution and the management of a leased facility, or wholly the responsibility of one or the other? If the plant is wholly owned by the institution, how is responsibility for such matters assigned within the overall organization? Is there a specific arrangement for a permanent physical "core" of administrative offices and record-keeping facilities, combined with a "periphery" of "as needed" leased facilities? If flexibility is maintained in this area, how are assessments of alternate plans for physical plant, owned or leased, developed, and what time span is needed to put them into effect? What factors, specifically, have governed the selection of the present site of the institution--in relation to local, regional, and national matters? Have proximity to library facilities, to other traditional or non-traditional institutions, been considered? Is access to transportation a major factor? What special considerations have to be given to accommodations if a mature student body is involved? What is the relationship to the immediate community? Are facilities in other

locations maintained or leased to enhance the working of off-campus activities of the students and faculty? How are they integrated into the overall pattern?

IX. Other Areas of Activity

A non-traditional institution is marked by its innovative and flexible attitude, and there may well be many activities unique to each institution. Describe these for the particular institution, illustrating how they fit into the overall pattern of the non-institutional body, and what demands, if any, they make on specific parts of the institution and its facilities. Such special activities may include work in the neighboring community, efforts at overcoming heritages of discrimination against women and minority members of society, or specialized research and teaching functions differentiated by level of study (undergraduate, graduate, and other) and by areas of particular specialization (e.g., advanced educational studies, creative writing or related endeavors, advanced psychological workshops, and so on). Each may color, to a greater or lesser degree, the overall functioning of the institution, or may represent a relatively isolated area of specialization within the institution. For each activity, areas of responsibility should be detailed, goals and aims assessed, and evaluative mechanisms described, whether qualitative or quantitative in nature.

X. Application of the Model

The end result of application of the non-traditional self-study model should not necessarily be construed as resulting in a standard written report. The use of videotape, tape recordings, visual aids, transcripts of group sessions, and free-form comments should be encouraged to the degree that they enable the underlying philosophy of the institution to emerge, and enable a clear protrait of the actual functioning of the institution on a day-to-day basis, including manifestations of the feelings of the participants, to be presented.

The Philosophy of Standards

In establishing a credible non-traditional institution of higher learning, the question of standards always presents

itself as an area of concern. The self-motivated, self-directed concept so subscribed to here presents the added problem of whether or not certain standards are being sacrificed in the name of personal growth and self-initiated intellectual development.

As the writer sees it, this is a hazard innate in the development of any institution which goes beyond the traditionally accepted methods of instruction. What is recommended is a firm approach on the part of the non-traditional institution in regard to its admittance procedures and rigid guidelines for degree candidates in relation to the completion of the dissertation and applicable research.

The institution sets up the requirements, and from that point on the student carries the responsibility for completing the requirements. If the institution is to have any credibility at all, it must not compromise on its standards, but the idea of self-directed education must be maintained if credible education is to be achieved.

What this means is that students come to the particular institution, realizing full well that the "burden of education" is on them. If the institution has been selective in admittance, then a high calibre of students is participating in the program, and, of course, that in itself sets a certain standard. Also, if the students cannot meet the requirements for the dissertation--time, methods, rough drafts, measurement, etc.--it is the responsibility of those teachers involved to convey the message that the standards are not being met.

What the non-traditional institution is doing is building responsibility in all educational aspects: the administration, the faculty, and the students. Each of these departments must maintain designated standards. If they do not, they are eliminated from the program. Specifically, the standards center around the philosophies of responsible, visible or measurable, intellectual growth, and contributions to the academic world in specific areas of investigation.

It goes without saying that all of this is quite subjective; however, education has always been, to some degree, subjective. This cannot be avoided, but what can be avoided is the shirking of responsibility. The "ideal" is, of course, what the non-traditional institution should strive for, and that would be knowledge of standards and a willingness to accept them and pursue them for one's own personal enrichment and for no other reason.

The Self-Study Model for Non-Traditional Institutions: Summary

The preceding discussion, and the schematic model presented, have sought to touch on aspects of innovative education by considering the Walden experience as a point of departure; by noting matters covered under traditional standards; and by formulating comments and observations on the basic elements and philosophy of a non-traditional self-study model as the prelude to the construction of the outline model. To summarize the discussion, it is necessary

to touch on the following considerations: the limitations of a generic self-study model; structural characteristics of a self-study model generally applicable to non-traditional institutions; and a summary of particular self-study mechanisms evolving from consideration of the Walden experience.

Walden is unique--and Walden is specialized. From these two factors stem two methodological difficulties in evolving a generic non-traditional self-study model. Walden may represent one point on a scale representing the range of innovative institutions in terms of its overall philosophy and structure; it is further circumscribed by virtue of its specialization in advanced educational studies. Obviously, other non-traditional bodies may fall elsewhere along that scale of innovation--in terms of size, age, location, residency requirements, relationship to parent bodies or to "sibling" organizations, and so on. Others may also be differentiated on the basis of differing specializations--perhaps ranging from undergraduate liberal arts programs through creative writing to an advanced scientific model seeking innovation in a limited area of investigation. If one of the key philosophical approaches of innovative non-traditional institutions is avoidance of rigidity of structure, and indeed a welcoming of flexibility in all areas, then it must be clearly recognized that an all-embracing self-study model, with methods of categorization and mechanisms of evaluation that attempt to cover all possibilities at all

levels in all disciplines, will be theoretically incoherent and extremely unwieldy in practice. Such a model would also, in all likelihood, replicate old evils of bureaucratic rationality and the static categorizations of the traditional educational order.

In avoiding such an undesirable situation, however, it is necessary to avoid swinging to the opposite extreme of high-sounding theoretical platitudes that offer little practical assistance to innovative higher educators who are engaged in building, and hence in evaluating, a serious new contribution to the world of learning. The present study had led to the conclusion that such a model can indeed be formulated and that its broad outlines are generically applicable. Such a model must rest on two main philosophical and pragmatic bases: firstly, the model must be dynamic rather than static; and, secondly, it must be flexible in application, particularly insofar as a rigid series of standards is concerned. A successful model, whatever the innovative institution involved, should be able coherently to grapple with the problems of off-campus activity as much as on-campus activity, with the problems of peripatetic or temporary facilities as well as fixed plant, with life-experience credits as much as, or in addition to, academic credits, and, most important of all, with maintaining excellence of educational standards in what must be a flexible total environment.

As far as the Walden experience is concerned, some other points should be emphasized. The purpose of the institution was clearly indicated in terms of non-traditional goals set forth and encouraged at the institution. In considering organizational and administrative aspects, importance was attached to the small and flexible nature of arrangements in these areas, with emphasis on "becoming" rather than "being." In terms of educational program, the evolution of self-checking mechanisms to cater to the "University without Walls" aspect of Walden was deemed appropriate. In the area of finances, it was found that the small size of Walden and the need to satisfy proprietary requirements made the complex budgetary systems of a large, year-round institution entirely inappropriate. Purchases were made, for example, on an "as needed" basis. In the area of faculty, it was noted that Walden's summer residency session was uniquely situated to draw on the highest levels of mature educational talent available nationally and that salaries paid were commensurate with these levels.

It was emphasized also that the short duration of the summer session called for careful pre-planning sessions to an extent not found in traditional bodies. In the library resources area, it was noted that Walden had concentrated on a core research-type specialized library in the field of education and was utilizing the concept of "Adjunct Libraries" to cater to the non-resident aspect of the Walden doctorate--an innovative procedure in its own right. In the area of

student personnel services, it was noted that the function of the program was to cater to a mature student body for a short-term period, utilizing the resources of that body, in contrast to the practice of the normal, large, static institution. In the area of physical plant, it was noted that Walden's flexibility raised entirely new areas of evaluation in terms of the leasing (without capital expenditure) of new facilities, and even the possibility of a peripatetic institution with no loss of educational excellence.

Finally, the traditional standards regarding Special Activity and Graduate Program were adjudged to be inappropriate and inapplicable to the Walden experience. In fact, "Special Activity" could be said to embrace the entire rationale of the Walden philosophy and its expression. The Walden graduate-level study program was shown to have a specialized nature.

Basic research into the sensitivity of Walden toward the creative and individual expression of students in attendance at Walden showed the institution to be of superior quality. The general consensus was in the direction of evaluating the institution as one in which a "humanized" educational experience was readily available. A further extension of this is the fact that Walden graduates are accepted and recognized by their peers for academic excellence; specifically, this recognition is achieved in their careers and their publications.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has noted the need for the evaluative mechanisms that are essential if any worthwhile educational process is to keep up with the changes that permeate contemporary American society--if it is to find major and significant expression in the realm of innovative non-traditional higher education. The study surveyed the history of higher education and noted that change in this area has never been a simple linear evolution, but rather a complex dialectical interrelationship between the forces of innovation, reflecting new needs and new aspirations in society, and the forces of the status quo. The experience of Walden University, a relatively new advanced center of higher education, was considered in detail; and, through examination of relevant data, those aspects of Walden's self-examination process that may be compared to the standards by which traditional institutions have been judged in terms of self-study, were also described. Areas of similarity were noted. More particularly, areas where Walden has initiated new thrusts not adequately covered by traditional self-study models were pointed out. During the associated discussion, some of the philosophical and practical considerations and parameters

that must be borne in mind when evolving a self-study model applicable to non-traditional institutions in general have been noted, and the results of a survey of alumni of Walden have also been considered.

Overall, the following major conclusions can be drawn:

1. That serious discussion of the whole area of evaluation of non-traditional institutions in higher education is both necessary and justifiable in terms of contemporary developments in American education and society.

2. That the self-study model, an assemblage of standards devised for use by traditional institutions, is not entirely appropriate if these evolving non-traditional bodies are to be adequately evaluated in their own terms and contexts.

3. That new areas of emphasis have to be explored and charted within the non-traditional field if adequate national non-traditional standards are to be evolved and successfully applied.

4. That the main characteristics of a generic self-study model geared to the needs of innovative institutions must basically rest on methodologies combining elements of dynamic and flexible analysis.

5. That such a self-study model cannot be made all-embracing and amenable to the categories and the detail of the traditional model. Because of the likely range of non-traditional bodies to be covered, a range covering many different needs, disciplines, and types of organization, a

rigid and detailed model would be both theoretically inopportune and practically counter-productive.

6. That the Walden experience as a model does offer guidance in areas of detail, ranging from the possibility of a peripatetic or leased-premises campus to the question of adjunct library and resource facilities and a whole range of non-residential opportunities resulting from Walden's "University without Walls" philosophy.

7. That a survey of the alumni of an institution of the Walden type, utilizing the research instrument used for the present study, and taking advantage both of the small size of the student body involved and the high level of expertise and commitment resulting from the mature professional nature of that body as a group, can itself adduce valuable data concerning overall evaluation of non-traditional educational experience, in their quantitative and qualitative aspects.

The following recommendations are made as a result of the present study:

1. A follow-up study of Walden alumni utilizing a research instrument developed for the purpose be carried out at annual intervals. In this way a useful and instructive body of data concerning Walden's growth and development can be accumulated.

2. That a research instrument be extended to include the theoretical and practical comments of the alumni. For example, a detailed survey could be made of national library

resources to develop the adjunct library concept further and to develop appropriate evaluative mechanisms at the same time; or a survey of sites suitable for institutions of the Walden type could be made and developed into a national data bank for use by all non-traditional institutions.

3. That additional surveys be made to determine the professional and academic progress of Walden alumni, perhaps in association with a control group of non-Walden educators, in order to develop adequate data as to the actual professional reactions to the Walden experience.

4. That more studies be made on the backgrounds of Walden students.

5. That other non-traditional bodies be encouraged to fill in the theoretical and practical outlines by equivalent studies geared to the specific needs of those institutions.

It is hoped that the net result of the activities recommended will be to advance the non-traditional movement in higher education by providing it with a sound underpinning in the areas of evaluation and self-study. It is further hoped that such studies will be made in the same spirit as the present study; that is, with the overall aim of humanizing the higher educational process, but in an appropriately critical and scholarly manner that effectively combines theoretical and philosophical discussion with an essential measure of realism and pragmatism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Heritage Dictionary, 1969 ed. S.v. "University."

Ashby, E. Universities under Siege. Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand, 1962.

Astin, A.W. The College Environment. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.

Barzun, Jacques. Graduate Study at Columbia. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

_____. The American University: How it Runs, Where it is Going. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Benjamin, Harold R.W. Higher Education in the American Republics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Bissell, C.T. The Strength of the University. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Bloom, Benjamin S., ed. Classification of Educational Goals. New York: David McKay, 1956.

Bowen, Howard R. and Douglass, Gordon K. Efficiency in Liberal Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, for the Macalester Foundation and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971.

Brubacher, John Seiler and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition: An American History, 1936-1956. New York: Harper and Row, 1958.

Campbell, D.T. "Ethnocentrism of Disciplines and the Fish-scale Model of Omniscience." In M. Sherif (ed.) Problems of Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Report. Berkeley, California: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, June 1973.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. "The University at the Service of Society." In Annual Report. New York: The Foundation, 1967.

Cartter, A.M. An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966(a).

Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. The University in America. Santa Barbara, California: The Center, 1966.

Cooper, R.M. "The College Teaching Crisis." Journal of Higher Education, XXXV (1964), 6-11.

Dressel, Paul L. "The Problem of Evaluation" in The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal, ed. Paul L. Dressel. Iowa City, Ia.: The American College Testing Program and the American Association for Higher Education, 1972.

Drucker, P. Age of Discontinuity. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Eckert, R.E. A University Looks at Its Program. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Fehl, Noah Edward. The Idea of a University in East and West. Hong Kong: Chung Chi College, 1962.

Flexner, A. Medical Education: A Comparative Study. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925.

Galbraith, J.K. The Affluent Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1958.

_____. The New Industrial State. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.

Gold, Samuel B. and Cross, K. Patricia, eds. Explorations in Non-Traditional Study. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Graham, G. "Turmoil in the Graduate Schools." New York Times Magazine, April 7, 1968.

Hare, K. On University Freedom. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.

Heard, A. The Lost Years in Graduate Education. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.

Hechinger, Fred M. "Much Talk But Little Action on Campus Reform." New York Times. Education Section, August 9, 1970.

Heiss, Ann M. Challenges to Graduate Schools: The Ph.D. Program in Ten Universities. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. A Profile of Change in Higher Education: Institutions in Transition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Hofstadter, R., and Metzker, W. The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

Hutchins, R.M. Education for Freedom. New York: Grove Press, 1956.

Jaspers, K. The Idea of the University. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.

Kelly, A.J. (ed.). The Quest for Relevance: Effective College Teaching. American Association for Higher Education, IV (March, 1969).

Kerr, Clark. Foreword to Efficiency in Liberal Education, by Howard R. Bowen and Gordon K. Douglass. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., for the Macalester Foundation and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971.

_____. Foreword to Graduate and Professional Education, 1980, by Lewis B. Mayhew. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970.

Ladd, Dwight R. Changes in Educational Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970.

Lichtman, R. "The University: Mask for Privilege?" The Center Magazine. Santa Barbara: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, January 1968.

Madden, H. On the Origin of Universities and Academic Degrees. London: Taylor Publishing Co., 1955.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Graduate and Professional Education, 1980. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1970.

_____. (ed.). Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1967.

Meriwether, Colyer. Our Colonial Curriculum: 1607-1776. Washington, D.C.: Capital Publishing Co., 1907.

Millett, J.D. Reconstruction of the University. University of Cincinnati: The Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education, 1968.

Morgan, James and Siragelden, Israel, "A Note on the Quality Dimension in Education." Journal of Political Economy (September-October, 1968), p. 1075.

Nowlis, V., et al. The Graduate Student as Teacher. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, Education Monograph, 1968.

Perkins, J. The University in Transition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Polanyi, M. Personal Knowledge. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Rice, A.K. The Modern University: A Model Organization. New York and London: Tavistock Publications, 1970.

Riesman, D. Constraint and Variety in American Education. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1958.

Rippa, S. Alexander. Education in a Free Society: An American History. New York: David Mckay, 1967.

Rogers, Carl. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrel Publishing Co., 1969.

Russell, J.D. "Faculty Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction." Journal of Experimental Education, XXXI (December, 1962), 135-139.

Shorter Oxford Dictionary, 3rd rev., 1965 ed. S.v. "University."

Snow, C.P. Science and Government. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

_____. The Two Cultures: And a Second Look. Cambridge: University Press, 1959.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Manual for the Institutional Self-Study Program of the Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Atlanta, Ga.: Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972.

_____. Standards of the College Delegate Assembly. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970; Bantam Books, 1971.

Trent, J.W. and Medsker, L.L. Beyond High School: A Psychosociological Study of 10,000 High School Graduates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Tyler, Ralph W. "Achievement Testing and Curriculum Construction" in Trends in Student Personnel Work, ed. E.G. Williamson. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1949.

United States Office of Education. Projection of Educational Statistics to 1974-75. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

Valley, John R. "Increasing the Options," in Recent Developments in College and University Degree Programs. Princeton, New Jersey: College Entrance Examination Board, 1972.

Walden University. Doctoral Program in Education. Naples, Florida: Walden University, Institute for Advanced Studies, 1973.

Walters, E. Graduate Education Today. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Weldon, K. Laurence. Inter-Provincial Comparisons of Cost and Quality of Higher Education. Toronto: Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario, 1970.

West, A. Present College Questions. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1903.

Whaley, W.G. "In Place of Slogans." Graduate Journal, VII (Spring, 1967), 281-299.

Wilson, A. "Wisdom is Better Than Strength." The Educational Record, XLI (January, 1960), 25-28.

Wolff, Robert Paul. The Ideal of the University. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Wolfle, D. Teachers for Tomorrow. Report of the Commission on Human Resources. New York: Ford Foundation, 1955.

APPENDIX A

STANDARDS OF THE COLLEGE DELEGATE ASSEMBLY, THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS[A]

Standard I: Purpose

Each institution should clearly define its purpose and should incorporate this definition into a statement which is a pronouncement of its role in the educational world. The institution's integrity is measured not only in terms of its stated purpose, but also in terms of its conscientious endeavor to fulfill this purpose.

Standard II: Organization and Administration

The administrative organization of an institution of higher learning should bring together its various resources and coordinate them effectively to accomplish its objectives. Although a similar pattern of organization for all member institutions is neither required nor expected, the organizational structure and the administrative processes should be well defined and understood by the entire college community.

Standard III: Educational Program

The educational program must be clearly related to the purposes of the institution. This relationship between purposes and program must be demonstrated in policies of admission, content of curricula, requirements for graduation, instructional methods and procedures, and quality of work required of the students.

Standard IV: Financial Resources

The financial resources of a college or university determine, in part, the quality of its educational program. Conversely, the quality of the educational program affects the ability of an institution to increase its financial

resources. The adequacy of the financial resources of an institution is to be judged in relation to the basic purposes of the institution, the scope of its program, and the number of its students.

Standard V: Faculty

The selection, development, and retention of a competent faculty at all academic levels is of major importance to all institutions. The relationship between faculty objectives and institutional purposes determines in large measure the effectiveness of the total educational program. The institution should make known its purposes and objectives to prospective faculty members, as well as its expectations of them. This should be done in order that objectives sought by the faculty will be in harmony with the institutional purposes.

Standard VI: Library

The library is a vital instrument of instruction, not only in general education but also in the cultural development of students and faculty. The library should be administered as part of the academic program. This administration should include a well-trained professional staff with representatives of the teaching faculty acting in an advisory capacity. The staff should be alert to new curricular development and needs. Services should be evaluated regularly to observe the library's effectiveness through the nature and extent of its use.

Standard VII: Student Personnel

Student development services should be directly related to the stated objectives of the institution and should assist students in the educational process in developing self-reliant, responsible behavior. Through student development services, the institution should demonstrate its concern for: programs of orientation, counseling, guidance, and academic advisement; reasonable academic staadards; preservation of appropriate freedoms of inquiry and expression; and participation in institutional activities, academic and otherwise. Objectives of student development services should be clearly defined and publicized.

Standard VIII: Physical Plant

The physical facilities, including buildings, equipment, and campus, should be designed and maintained to

serve the needs of the institution in relation to its stated purposes. There should be sufficient campus area to provide adequately for buildings and such activities as are related to the educational program of the institution. The physical facilities should be used as efficiently as possible in keeping with the educational program of the institution and the students it serves. The architectural design and appearance of the physical plant should be in harmony as far as practicable, and should be aesthetically compatible to the educational mission of the institution. A master plan for campus development should be maintained.

Standard IX: Special Activities

Many institutions have developed a variety of supplemental and special educational programs in fulfilling their stated objectives, their public and community service demands, and their responsibilities to their constituents. Special activities programs are defined as: operationally separate units, external or special degree programs, off-campus classes and units, independent study programs including correspondence and home study, conferences and institutes including short courses and workshops, foreign travel and study, media instruction including radio and television, and on-campus programs including special summer sessions and special evening classes.

Standard X: Graduate Program

A graduate program comprises a course of study beyond the baccalaureate level usually leading to an advanced degree. An institution inaugurating, continuing, or expanding a graduate program should have curricula and resources available beyond those provided for the undergraduate college. Since the quality and excellence of graduate instruction should be of constant concern to every institution offering graduate work, it is essential that the provisions for graduate instruction should include an adequate administrative organization, a competent faculty in the major and supporting fields, and library and laboratory facilities consonant with the programs offered. An institution contemplating the inauguration of a program at a higher degree level should inform the Executive Secretary of the Commission at least one year in advance and arrange for a preliminary advisory study by the Commission before undertaking the program.

*Note: Standard descriptions are taken, in condensed form, from Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Standards of the College Delegate Assembly (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1972), pp. 2-22.

APPENDIX B

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS: WALDEN UNIVERSITY*

I. Requirements for Admission as Matriculated Student

A. Master's Degree + 16 semester hour credits or its equivalent. (At the request of the applicant, and with the approval of the University, life experience can be recognized and accepted in lieu of academic prerequisites.)

Where necessary, independent course work amounting to a total of 6 credits may be taken during the Fall and Spring Semesters to complete Matriculation requirements.

B. A minimum of 3 years' experience in education or an allied professional field.

C. An official transcript from each college previously attended.

D. Two current letters of recommendation from educators or related professionals attesting to the ability of the applicant to successfully complete graduate work.

E. Enrollment in the Summer Residency Session Program.

II. Requirements for Candidacy Status

A. Matriculated status.

B. Successful completion of Summer Session on campus.

C. Acceptance of dissertation topic for Ph.D. or Ed.D. or,

D. Acceptance of a high quality project topic for the Ed.D.

E. Registration for Fall Semester.

III. Requirements for Doctoral Status

A. Candidacy status.

B. Completion of at least two semesters of dissertation guidance.

C. Acceptance by the University Review Committee of dissertation project.

D. Deficiencies, if any, will be cited and must be removed prior to Commencement.

E. Satisfaction of all University requirements.

IV. Basic Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) Degree

A. At least 70 semester hours of academic work beyond the baccalaureate, of which no less than 24 semester hours be taken at Walden University. The 24 semester hours can be achieved by satisfactorily completing the summer session (10 semester hours) and two semesters of dissertation guidance and development. (14 semester hours.)

B. Completion of dissertation.

C. Acceptance by Review Committee of dissertation or project.

D. Other requirements as mutually agreed upon by Review Committee and the candidate.

V. Basic Requirements for the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) Degree

A. At least 70 semester hours of academic work beyond the baccalaureate, of which no less than 24 semester hours be taken at Walden University. The 24 semester hours can be achieved by satisfactorily completing the summer session (10 semester hours) and two semesters of dissertation guidance and development. (14 semester hours.)

B. Completion of dissertation or project.

C. Acceptance by Review Committee of dissertation or project.

D. Other requirements as mutually agreed upon by Review Committee and the candidate.

Note: It is expected that an Ed.D. candidate would typically devote himself to action oriented or applied research, lending his efforts so as to provide the utilization of known principles to practical situations, rather than concentrating on the preparation of a dissertation lending itself primarily to the establishment of new principles or truths.

Transfer Credits

Graduate work taken at other recognized institutions may be applied toward the doctoral degree program at Walden University providing they indicate a relationship to the general requirements listed. Any course having less than a "C" grade or its equivalent will not be accepted for credit.

It will be the function of Admissions to determine the acceptance or rejection of course credits in all instances involving transfer of advance credits.

Final determination of credit standing will be made prior to admission to matriculated status.

Residency Requirements

Residency is here defined as the period of time encompassed by three successive registrations at Walden University. During these sessions, (one summer on-campus and two sessions off), a total of 24 credits must be completed in residency: 10 during the summer session, and 7 during each of the following two semesters.

---

*See Walden University, Institute for Advanced Studies, Doctoral Program in Education (Naples, Fla.: Walden University, October, 1973), pp. 17-19.